

INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION

ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE'S
LAHORE RESOLUTION
POPULARLY KNOWN AS
"PAKISTAN"



AN UNBIASED, SCIENTIFIC
AND ANALYTICAL STUDY
BEING A COLLECTION OF
ESSAYS BY VARIOUS AUTHORS



Published by M. H. Sayid,
Mount Pleasant Rd. Malabar Hill, Bombay
and Printed by him at Saxon Press
43 Fort Street, Bombay

TO those who really wish to examine the problems of India's future constitution, this collection may help. It is with this object in view that I have selected a few of the well considered views in a convenient form of a booklet.

There are in India today four main forces viz., the British, the Indian Princes, the Hindus and the Muslims, that are concerned with the future fate and destiny of 400 millions of the peoples who inhabit this vast sub-continent. India has never been, could never be and is not a National State. To contemplate a government of such a vast sub-continent on the basis of one nation and United India, when we know that it is composed of nationalities, is to pursue the will-o-the-wisp. The more the problem is honestly examined, the more one must be driven to the conclusion that the only solution of India's future lies in the division of India. That is why, after full and careful deliberations, Muslim India through their only authoritative and representative organisation—the All India Muslim League—resolved by their resolution in its full sessions at Lahore on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th March 1940, and laid down the basic principle that geographically contiguous units should be demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute Independent State in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign, and that adequate effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in the regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

This is the way to achieve India's freedom in the quickest possible time and to secure independence from the control and interference of His Majesty's Government and the Parliament, but it does not rule out continuation of relations with Great Britain with necessary adjustments.

I hope that this booklet will make a considerable contribution towards the clarification of the Lahore Resolution of the All India Muslim League which raises a fundamental issue, and I trust that every well-wisher of this vast sub-continent will approach the subject free from prejudice, bias and sentiments.

Let us examine this problem also independently of the past notions which have been drilled into us by those who thought their selfish interests would be served best by preaching what does not exist nor is there any real basis for it viz. united India, one nation and one country. It is futile to indulge in such visionary ideals—El Dorado—divorced completely from realities. Statesmanship demands that we should face facts and real basis and shape our course accordingly.

Bombay

7th October 1940

CONTENTS.

	Page
1 Presidential Address by Mr M A Jinnah at Lahore	1
2 Lahore Resolution No 1 March 1940	16
3 Message sent by Mr M A Jinnah to the Bombay Presidency Provincial Muslim League Conference at Hubli May 1940	18
4 An article written by Mr M A Jinnah for Time and Tide	22
5 A Press statement by Mr M A Jinnah dated the 1st April 1940	29
6 Articles by M R T — Protection Versus Separation	33
7 Nationalism is no solution of Hindu Muslim problem	42
8 One Nation Myth Exposed	51
9 Pak stan scheme and the Sikhs	62
10 Congress does not face realities	71
11 Two Indias — by Mr Patrick Lacey	76
12 Speech by Periyar E V Ramaswami at Salem	83
13 Partition of India the proper solution — by Mr Gopaul Chetty	90
14 Dravidian Regions should form a Separate State — by Mr A C Balasundara Nayakar	94
15 United States of India — by Mr Tarun Bhattacharya	100
16 Pakistan — by Mr I H Qureshi	103
17 Can Hindus and Muslims ever become one nation? by Mr Wahid Ashraf	107
18 Way to India's Salvation — a leading article in The Assam Herald	116
19 Concept of a separate Muslim State — by Mr K S Abdur Rahman Khan	120
20 Is India One Nation? by Mr Jamil ud din Ahmed	128
21 Viceroy's Statement	140
22 Mr Amery on India's Political Goal	143

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

At the All India Muslim League Lahore Session March 1940

By Mr M A JINNAH

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are meeting today in our session after fifteen months. The last session of the All India Muslim League took place at Patna in December 1938. Since then many developments have taken place. I shall first shortly tell you what the All-India Muslim League had to face after the Patna session of 1938. You remember that one of the tasks which was imposed on us and which is far from completed yet was to organise Muslim Leagues all over India. We have made enormous progress during the last fifteen months in this direction. I am glad to inform you that we have established Provincial Leagues in every province. The next point is that in every bye-election to the Legislative Assemblies we had to fight with powerful opponents. I congratulate the Musalmans for having shown enormous grit and spirit throughout our trials. There was not a single bye-election in which our opponents won against Muslim League candidates. In the last election to the U P Council that is the Upper Chamber the Muslim League's success was cent per cent. I do not want to weary you with details of what we have been able to do in the way of forging ahead in the direction of organising the Muslim League. But I may tell you that it is going up by leaps and bounds.

Next you may remember that we appointed a committee of ladies at the Patna session. It is of very great importance to us because I believe that it is absolutely essential for us to give every opportunity to our women to participate in our struggle of life and death. Women can do a great deal within their homes even under purdah. We appointed this committee with a view to enable them to participate in the work of the League. The objects of this central committee were (1) to organise provincial and district Muslim Leagues, (2) to enlist a larger number of women to the membership of the Muslim League, (3) to carry on an intensive propaganda amongst Muslim women throughout India in order to create in them a sense of a greater political conscious-

ness—because if political consciousness is awakened amongst our women, remember, your children will not have much to worry about, (4) to advise and guide them in all such matters as mainly rest on them for the uplift of Muslim Society This central committee, I am glad to say, started its work seriously and earnestly It has done a great deal of useful work I have no doubt that when we come to deal with their report of work done we shall really feel grateful to them for all the services that they have rendered to the Muslim League

We had many difficulties to face from January 1939 right up to the declaration of war We had to face the Vidyā Mandir in Nagpur We had to face the Wardha Scheme all over India We had to face ill-treatment and oppression to Muslims in the Congress governed provinces We had to face the treatment meted out to Muslims in some of the Indian States such as Jaipur and Bhavnagar We had to face a vital issue that arose in that little state of Rajkot Rajkot was the acid test made by the Congress which would have affected one-third of India Thus the Muslim League had all along to face various issues from January 1939 up to the time of the declaration of war Before the war was declared the greatest danger to the Muslims of India was the possible inauguration of the federal scheme in the Central Government We know what machinations were going on But the Muslim League was stoutly resisting them in every direction We felt that we could never accept the dangerous scheme of the Central Federal Government embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935 I am sure that we have made no small contribution towards persuading the British Government to abandon the scheme of Central Federal Government In creating that mind in the British Government the Muslim League, I have no doubt, played no small part You know that the British people are very obdurate, people They are also very conservative, and although they are very clever, they are slow in understanding After the war was declared, the Viceroy naturally wanted help from the Muslim League It was only then that he realised that the Muslim League was a power For it will be remembered that up to the time of the declaration of war, the Viceroy never thought of me but of Gandhi and Gandhi alone I have been the leader of an important party in the Legislature for a considerable time, larger than the one I have the honour to lead at present, the Muslim League Party in the Central Legislature Yet, the Viceroy never thought of me before Therefore, when I got this invitation from the Viceroy along with Mr Gandhi, I wondered within

myself why I was so suddenly promoted and then I concluded that the answer was the 'All-India Muslim League' whose President I happen to be. I believe that was the worst shock that the Congress High Command received because it challenged their sole authority to speak on behalf of India. And it is quite clear from the attitude of Mr Gandhi and the High Command that they have not yet recovered from that shock. My point is that, I want you to realise the value, the importance, the significance of organising ourselves. I will not say anything more on the subject.

But a great deal yet remains to be done. I am sure from what I can see and hear that the Muslim India is now conscious, is now awake and the Muslim League has by now grown into such a strong institution that it cannot be destroyed by anybody whoever he may happen to be. Men may come and men may go, but the League will live for ever.

Now, coming to the period after the declaration of war our position was that we were between the devil and the deep sea. But I do not think that the devil or the deep sea is going to get away with it. Anyhow our position is this. We stand unequivocally for the freedom of India. But it must be freedom of all India and not freedom of one section or, worse still, of the Congress caucus and slavery of Musalmans and other minorities.

Situated in India as we are, we naturally have our past experiences and particularly the experiences of the past 2½ years of provincial constitution in the Congress governed provinces we have learnt many lessons. We are now, therefore, very apprehensive and can trust nobody. I think it is a wise rule for every one not to trust anybody too much. Sometimes we are led to trust people but when we find in actual experience that our trust has been betrayed surely that ought to be sufficient lesson for any man not to continue his trust in those who have betrayed us. Ladies and gentlemen, we never thought that the Congress High Command would have acted in the manner in which they actually did in the Congress governed provinces. I never dreamt that they would ever come down so low as that. I never could believe that there would be a gentleman's agreement between the Congress and the Government to such an extent that although we cried hoarse, week in and out, the Governors were supine and the Governor General was helpless. We reminded them of their special responsibilities to us and

to other minorities and the solemn pledges they had given to us. But all that had become a dead letter. Fortunately, Providence came to our help and that gentlemen's agreement was broken to pieces and the Congress, thank Heavens, went out of office. I think they are regretting their resignations very much. Their bluff was called off. So far so good. I therefore appeal to you, in all seriousness that I can command, to organise yourselves in such a way that you may depend upon none except your own inherent strength. That is your only safeguard and the best safeguard. Depend upon yourselves. That does not mean that we should have ill will or malice towards others. In order to safeguard your rights and interests you must create that strength in yourselves that you may be able to defend yourselves. That is all that I want to urge.

Now what is our position with regard to future constitution? It is, that as soon as circumstances permit or immediately after the war at the latest the whole problem of India's future constitution must be examined *de novo* and the Act of 1935 must go once for all. We do not believe in asking the British Government to make declarations. These declarations are really of no use. You cannot possibly succeed in getting the British Government out of this country by asking them to make declarations. However, the Congress asked the Viceroy to make a declaration. The Viceroy said, 'I have made the declaration.' The Congress said, 'No, no, we want another kind of declaration. You must declare now and at once that India is free and independent with the right to frame its own constitution by a constituent assembly to be elected on the basis of adult franchise or as low a franchise as possible. This Assembly will of course satisfy the minorities' legitimate interests. Mr. Gandhi says that if the minorities are not satisfied then he is willing that some tribunal of the highest character and most impartial should decide the dispute. Now, apart from the impracticable character of this proposal and quite apart from the fact that it is historically and constitutionally absurd to ask the ruling power to abdicate in favour of a Constituent Assembly—apart from all that, suppose we do not agree as to the franchise according to which the Central Assembly is to be elected or suppose we the solid body of Muslim representatives do not agree with the non-Muslim majority in the Constituent Assembly, what will happen? It is said that we have no right to disagree with regard to anything that this assembly may do in framing a national constitution of this huge sub-continent except those in matters which may be germane

to the safeguards for the minorities. So we are given the privilege to disagree only with regard to what may be called strictly safeguards of the rights and interests of minorities. We are also given the privilege to send our own representatives by separate electorates. Now, this proposal is based on the assumption that as soon as this constitution comes into operation the British hand will disappear. Otherwise there will be no meaning in it. Of course, Mr Gandhi says that the constitution will decide whether the British will disappear and if so to what extent. In other words his proposal comes to this. First give me the declaration that we are a free and independent nation then I will decide what I should give you back. Does Mr Gandhi really want the complete independence of India when he talks like this? But whether the British disappear or not, it follows that extensive powers must be transferred to the people. In the event of there being a disagreement between the majority of the Constituent Assembly and the Musalmans in the first instance, who will appoint the tribunal? And suppose an agreed tribunal is possible and the award is made and the decision given, who will, may I know, be there to see that this award is implemented or carried out in accordance with the terms of that award? And who will see that it is honoured in practice because, we are told, the British will have parted with their power mainly or completely? Then what will be the sanction behind the award which will enforce it. We come back to the same answer, the Hindu majority would do it and will it be with the help of the British bayonet or the Gandhi's "Ahimsa". Can we trust them any more? Besides, Ladies and Gentlemen, can you imagine that a question of this character, of social contract upon which the future constitution of India would be based affecting 90 millions of Mussalmans, can be decided by means of a judicial tribunal? Still, that is the proposal of the Congress.

Before I deal with what Mr Gandhi said a few days ago I shall deal with the pronouncements of some of the other Congress leaders—each one speaking with a different voice. Mr Rajagopala Acharya, the ex-Prime Minister of Madras says that the only panacea for Hindu Muslim unity is the joint electorates. That is his prescription as one of the great doctors of the Congress Organisation. (Laughter) Babu Rajendra Prasad on the other hand only a few days ago says 'Oh, what more do the Mussalmans want?' I will read to you his words. He says, referring to the minority question,

"If Britain would concede our right of self determination surely all these differences would disappear," How will our differences disappear? He does not explain or enlighten us about it

'But so long as Britain remained and held power, the differences would continue to exist. The Congress has made it clear that the future constitution would be framed not by the Congress alone but by representatives of all political parties and religious groups. The Congress has gone further and declared that the minorities can have their representatives elected for this purpose by separate electorates, though the Congress regards separate electorates as an evil. It will be representative of all the peoples of this country, irrespective of their religion and political affiliations who will be deciding, the future constitution of India and not this or that party. What better guarantees can the minorities have? So according to Babu Rajendra Prasad the moment we enter the Assembly we shall shed all our political affiliations, and religions and everything else. This is what Babu Rajendra Prasad said as late as 18th March '40. And this is now what Mr. Gandhi said on the 20th of March '40, He says —

"To me Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Harijans, are all alike. I cannot be frivolous"—but I think he is frivolous—"I cannot be frivolous when I talk of Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah. He is my brother."

The only difference is this that brother Gandhi has three votes and I have only one vote. (Laughter)

"I would be happy indeed if he could keep me in his pocket." I do not know really what to say to this latest offer of his.

'There was a time when I could say that there was no Muslim whose confidence I did not enjoy. It is my misfortune that it is not so today."

Why has he lost the confidence of the Muslims today? May I ask Ladies and Gentlemen?

"I do not read all that appears in the Urdu Press, but perhaps I get a lot of abuse there. I am not sorry for it. I still believe that without Hindu-Muslim settlement there can be no Swaraj."

Mr. Gandhi has been saying this now for the last 20 years

"You will perhaps ask in that case why do I talk of a fight I do so because it is to be a fight for a Constituent Assembly"

He is fighting the British But may I point out to Mr Gandhi and the Congress that you are fighting for a Constituent Assembly which the Muslims say we cannot accept, which, the Muslims say, means three to one, about which the Mussalmans say that they will never be able, in that way by the the counting of heads, to come to any agreement which will be real agreement from the hearts, which will enable us to work as friends and therefore this idea of a Constituent Assembly is objectionable, apart from other objections But he is fighting for the Constituent Assembly, not fighting the Mussalmans at all

He says, "I do so because it is to be a fight for a Constituent Assembly If Muslims who come to the Constituent Assembly" Mark the words "who come to the Constituent Assembly through Muslim votes"—he is first forcing us to come to that Assembly—and then says "declare that there is nothing common between Hindus and Muslims then alone I would give up all hope but even then I would agree with them because they read the Koran and I have also studied something of that holy book" (Laughter)

So he wants the Constituent Assembly for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the Mussalmans and if they do not agree then he will give up all hopes, but even then he will agree with us (Laughter) Well, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, is this the way to show any real genuine desire, if there existed any to come to a settlement with the Mussalmans? (Voices of no, no) Why does not Mr Gandhi agree, and I have suggested to him more than once and I repeat it again from this platform, why does not Mr Gandhi honestly now acknowledge that the Congress is a Hindu Congress, that he does not represent anybody except the solid body of Hindu people? Why should not Mr Gandhi be proud to say "I am a Hindu, Congress has solid Hindu backing"? I am not ashamed of saying that I am a Mussalman (Hear, hear and applause) I am right and I hope and I think even a blind man must have been convinced by now that the Muslim League has solid backing of the Mussalmans of India (Hear, hear). Why then all this camouflage? Why all these machinations? Why all these methods to coerce the British to overthrow the Mussalmans? Why this declaration of non-co-operation? Why this threat of civil disobedience? And why fight for a Constituent Assembly for the sake of ascertaining whether

the Mussalmans agree or they do not agree? (Hear, hear). Why not come as a Hindu leader proudly representing your people and let me meet you proudly representing the Mussalmans (Hear, hear and applause). This all that I have to say so far as the Congress is concerned.

So far as the British Government is concerned, our negotiations are not concluded yet as you know. We had asked for assurances on several points, at any rate we have made some advance with regard to one point and that is this. You remember our demand was that the entire problem of future constitution of India should be examined *de novo*, apart from the Government of India Act of 1935. To that the Viceroy's reply, with the authority of His Majesty's Government, was—I had better quote that—I will not put it in my own words: This is the reply that was sent to us on 23rd December:

"My answer to your first question is that the declaration I made with the approval of His Majesty's Government on October the 13th last does not exclude

Mark the words—"does not exclude examination of any part either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based". (Hear, hear)

As regards other matters, we are still negotiating and the most important points are (1) that no declaration should be made by His Majesty's Government with regard to the future constitution of India without our approval and consent. (Hear, hear and applause) and that no settlement of any question should be made with any party behind our back. (Hear, hear), unless our approval and consent is given to it. Well, ladies and gentlemen, whether the British Government in their wisdom agree to give us that assurance or not, but I trust that they will still see that it is a fair and just demand when we say that we cannot leave the future fate and the destiny of 90 millions of people in the hands of any other judge. We and we alone wish to be the final arbiter. Surely that is a just demand. We do not want that the British Government should thrust upon the Mussalmans a constitution which they do not approve of and to which they do not agree. Therefore the British Government will be well advised to give that assurance and give the Mussalmans complete peace and confidence in this matter and win their friendship. But whether they do that or not, after all, as I told you before, we must depend on our own inherent strength and I make it plain from this

platform, that if any declaration is made, if any interim settlement is made without our approval and without our consent, the Mussalmans of India will resist it (Hear, hear and applause) And no mistake should be made on that score

Then the next point was with regard to Palestine We are told that endeavours, earnest endeavours, are being made to meet the reasonable, national demands, of the Arabs Well, we cannot be satisfied by earnest endeavours, sincere endeavours, best endeavours' (Laughter) We want that the British Government should in fact and actually meet the demands of the Arabs in Palestine (Hear hear)

Then the next point was with regard to the sending of the troops outside Here there is some misunderstanding But anyhow we have made our position clear that we never intended and, in fact, language does not justify it if there is any misapprehension or apprehension, that the Indian troops should not be used to the fullest in the defence of our own country What we wanted the British Government to give us assurance of was that Indian troops should not be sent against any Muslim country or any Muslim power. (Hear, hear) Let us hope that we may yet be able to get the British Government to clarify the position further

This then is the position with regard to the British Government The last meeting of the Working Committee had asked the Viceroy to reconsider his letter of the 23rd of December having regard to what has been explained to him in pursuance of the resolution of the Working Committee dated the 3rd of February and we are informed that the matter is receiving his careful consideration

Ladies and Gentlemen, That is where we stand-after the War and up to the 3rd February

As far as our internal position is concerned, we have also been examining it and, you know, there are several schemes which have been sent by various well informed constitutionalists and others who take interest in the problem of India's future constitution, and we have also appointed a sub-committee to examine the details of the schemes that have come in so far But one thing is quite clear, it has always been taken for granted mistakenly that the Mussalmans are a minority and of course we have got used to it for such a long time that these settled notions sometimes are very difficult to remove The Mussalmans are

not a minority. The Mussalmans are a nation by any definition. The British and particularly the Congress proceed on the basis, 'Well, you are a minority after all, what do you want?' "What else do the minorities want, just as Babu Rajendra Prasad said. But surely the Mussalmans are not a minority. We find that even according to the British map of India we occupy large parts of this country, where the Mussalmans are in a majority—such as Bengal, Punjab, N W F P, Sind and Baluchistan.

Now the question is what is the best solution of this problem between the Hindus and the Musalmans? We have been considering, and as I have already said, a committee has been appointed to consider the various proposals. But whatever the final scheme of constitution, I will present to you my views and I will just read to you in confirmation of what I am going to put before you, a letter from Lala Lajpat Rai to Mr C R Das. It was written, I believe, about 12 or 15 years ago and that letter has been produced in a book by one Indra Prakash recently published and that is how this letter has come to light. This is what Lala Lajpat Rai, a very astute politician and a staunch Hindu Mahasabhiite said. But before I read his letter it is plain from that you cannot get away from being a Hindu if you are Hindu. (Laughter) The word 'nationalist' has now become the play of conjurers in politics. This is what he says.

"There is one point more which has been troubling me very much of late and one which I want you to think carefully and that is the question of Hindu Mohammadan unity. I have devoted most of my time during the last six months to the study of Muslim history and Muslim law and I am inclined to think it is neither *possible nor practicable*. Assuming and admitting the sincerity of Mohammadan leaders in the non-co-operation movement, I think their religion provides an effective bar to anything of the kind.

You remember the conversation I reported to you in Calcutta which I had with Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr Kitchlew. There is no finer Mohammadan in Hindustan than Hakim Ajmal Khan, but can any Muslim leader over-ride the Koran? I can only hope that my reading of Islamic law is incorrect."

I think his reading is quite incorrect. (Laughter)

"And nothing would relieve me more than to be convinced that it is so. But if it is right then it comes to this, that although we can unite

against the British we cannot do so to rule Hindusthan on British lines We cannot do so to rule Hindustan on *democratic lines*"

Ladies and Gentelmen, when Lala Lajpat Rai said that we cannot rule this country on democratic lines it was alright but when I had the temerity to speak the same truth about 18 months ago there was a shower of attacks and criticism But Lala Lajpat Rai said 15 years ago that we cannot do so viz , rule Hindusthan on democratic lines What is the remedy ? The remedy according to Congress is to keep us in the minority and under the majority rule Lala Lajpat Rai proceeds further

What is then the remedy ? I am not afraid of the seven crores of Mussalmans But I think the seven crores in Hindustan plus the armed hosts of Afganistan, Central Asia Arabia Mesopotamia and Turkey, will be irresistible " (Laughter)

"I do honestly and sincerely belive in the necessity or desirability of Hindu Muslim unity I am also fully prepared to trust the Muslim leaders But what about the injunctions of the Koran and Hadis ? The leaders cannot override them Are we then doomed ? I hope your learned mind and wise head will find some way out of this difficulty"

Now, ladies and gentlemen, that is merely a letter written by one great Hindu leader to another great Hindu leader fifteen years ago Now, I should like to put before you my views on the subject as it strikes me taking everything into consideration at the present moment. The British Government and Parliament, and more so the British nation, have been for many decades past brought up and nurtured with settled notions about India's future, based on developments in their own country which has built up the British constitution, functioning now through the Houses of Parliament and the system of cabinet Their concept of party government functioning on political planes has become the ideal with them as the best form of government for every country, and the one-sided and powerful propaganda, which naturally appeals to the British, has led them into a serious blunder, in producing a constitution envisaged in the Government of India Act of 1935 We find that the most leading statesmen of Great Britain, saturated with these notions have in their pronoucements seriously asserted and expressed a hope that the passage of time will harmonise the inconsistent elements in India

A leading journal like the London Times, commenting on the Government of India Act of 1935, wrote, 'undoubtedly the difference between the Hindus and Muslims is not of religion in the strict sense of the word but also of law and culture, that they may be said indeed to represent two entirely distinct and separate civilisations. However, in the course of time the superstitions will die out and India will be moulded into a single nation'. So according to the London Times the only difficulties are superstitions. These fundamental and deeprooted differences, spiritual, economic, cultural, social and political have been euphemised as mere 'superstitions'. But surely, it is a flagrant disregard of the past history of the sub-continent of India as well as the fundamental Islamic conception of society *vis a vis* that of Hinduism to characterise them as mere 'superstitions'. Notwithstanding thousand years of close contact, nationalities which are as divergent today as ever, cannot at any time be expected to transform themselves into one nation merely by means of subjecting them to a democratic constitution and holding them forcibly together by unnatural and artificial methods of British Parliamentary Statutes. What the unitary government of India for 150 years had failed to achieve cannot be realised by the imposition of a central federal government. It is inconceivable that the fiat or the writ of a government so constituted can ever command a willing and loyal obedience throughout the sub-continent by various nationalities except by means of armed force behind it.

The problem in India is not of an intercommunal character, but manifestly of an international one, and it must be treated as such. So long as this basic and fundamental truth is not realised any constitution that may be built will result in disaster and will prove destructive and harmful not only to the Mussalmans, but to the British and Hindus also. If the British Government are really in earnest and sincere to secure peace and happiness of the people of this sub-continent, the only course open to us all is to allow the major nations separate homelands by dividing India into 'autonomous national states'. There is no reason why these states should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of one to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural good will by international pacts between them, and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours. This will lead further to a friendly settlement all the more easily with regard to minorities by reci-

procal arrangements and adjustments between Muslim India and Hindu India, which will far more adequately and effectively safeguard the rights and interest of Muslims and various other minorities

It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religious in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literature. They neither intermarry, nor interdine together and, indeed they belong to two different civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state.

History has presented to us many examples such as the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, Czechoslovakia and Poland. History has also shown to us many geographical tracts, much smaller than the sub-continent of India, which otherwise might have been called one country but which have been divided into as many states as there are nations inhabiting them. Balkan Peninsula comprises as many as 7 or 8 sovereign states. Likewise, the Portuguese and the Spanish stand divided in the Iberian Peninsula. Whereas under the plea of unity of India and one nation, which does not exist, it is sought to pursue here the line of one central government when we know that the history of the last 12 hundreds years, has failed to achieve unity and has witnessed, during the ages, India always divided into Hindu India and Muslim India. The present artificial unity of India dates back only to the British conquest and is maintained by the British bayonet, but the termination of the British regime, which is implicit in the recent declaration of His

Majesty's Government will be the herald of the entire break up with worse disaster than has ever taken place during the last one thousand years under Muslims. Surely that is not the legacy which Britain would bequeath to India after 150 years of her rule nor would Hindu and Muslim India risk such a sure catastrophe.

Muslim India cannot accept any constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities can only mean Hindu Raj. Democracy of the kind with which the Congress High Command is enamoured would mean the complete destruction of what is most precious in Islam. We have had ample experience of the working of the provincial constitutions during the last two and a half years and any repetition of such a government must lead to civil war and raising of private armies as recommended by Mr. Gandhi to Hindus of Sukkur when he said that they must defend themselves violently or non violently blow for blow and if they could not they must emigrate.

Mussalmans are not a minority as it is commonly known and understood. One has only got to look round. Even today according to the British map of India out of 11 provinces where the Muslims dominate more or less are functioning notwithstanding the decision of the Hindu Congress High Command to non-co operate and prepare for civil disobedience. Mussalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation and they must have their homelands, their territory and their state. We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbours as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people. Honesty demands and vital interest of millions of our people impose a sacred duty upon us to find an honourable and peaceful solution which would be just and fair to all. But at the same time we cannot be moved or diverted from our purpose and objective by threats or intimidations. We must be prepared to face all difficulties and consequences, make all the sacrifices that may be required of us to achieve the goal we have set in front of us.

Ladies and gentlemen that is the risk before us. I fear I have gone beyond my time limit. There are many things that I should like to tell you but I have already published a little pamphlet containing most

of the things that I have been saying and I think you can easily get that publication both in English and in Urdu from the League Office. It might give you a clearer idea of our aims. It contains very important resolutions of the Muslim League and various other statements. Anyhow, I have placed before you the task that lies ahead of us. Do you realise how big and stupendous it is? Do you realise that you cannot get freedom or independence by mere arguments? I should appeal to the intelligentsia. The intelligentsia in all countries in the world have been the pioneers of any movements for freedom. What does the Muslim intelligentsia propose to do? I may tell you that unless you get this into your blood, unless you are prepared to take off your coats and are willing to sacrifice all that you can and work selflessly, earnestly and sincerely for your people, you will never realise your aim. Friends, I therefore want you to make up your mind definitely and then think of devices and organise your people, strengthen your organisation and consolidate the Mussalmans all over India. I think that the masses are wide awake. They only want your guidance and your lead. Come forward as servants of Islam, organise the people economically, socially, educationally and politically and I am sure that you will be a power that will be accepted by everybody. (Cheers)

Text of Resolution No. 1 on future constitution of India passed at the 27th Annual Session of the All India Muslim League held at Lahore on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th of March 1940

(1) While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All India Muslim League, as indicated in their resolutions dated the 27th of August, 17th and 18th of September and 22nd of October 1939, and 3rd of February 1940 on the constitutional issue, this Session of the All India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, is totally unsuited to, and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India

(2) It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October 1939 made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government is reassuring in so far as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act 1935, is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India, Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered *de novo* and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent

(3) Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to Muslims unless it is designed on the following 'basic principle, viz, that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute "Independent States" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign

That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in these regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation

with them and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specially provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them

This Session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary

Message sent by Mr. M. A. Jinnah to the Bombay Presidency Provincial Muslim League Conference held at Hubli on the 26th and 27th May 1940

I am extremely sorry that I am unable to attend the Bombay Presidency Provincial Muslim League Conference. Believe me I would have come if it were possible for me to do so. It may appear that I can easily come probably for a day and that I am shirking, but I hope you will accept when I say that there are very strong and cogent reasons that prevent me at this moment to undertake the journey. However my entire heart and soul is with you. I wish the conference every success most sincerely and from the bottom of my heart.

I am grateful to the organisers and to the people for their desire to see me participate in the conference. I thank them for their kind regard and affection for me but I feel confident that under the guidance and presidentship of the Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad and other prominent leaders who are going to participate in the deliberations of the conference it will be a great success.

Let me say a few words to the Mussalmans of Southern Division. The All-India Muslim League has given the Mussalmans of India the correct lead. It has given them a flag, a platform, a policy and a well-considered program and finally it has defined the ideal and the true goal for Muslim India, by its resolution at Lahore last March, to fight for and achieve it at any sacrifice, for therein lies their true salvation.

I am asked, will the British agree to the basic and fundamental principles of the Lahore Resolution, namely to create Independent Muslim States in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India? Whether they agree or whether they do not, we shall fight for it to the last ditch. I know that the British politicians, press and public are still holding on to the conception of unity and one India, but I am convinced that it is a self-deception and complete ignorance of reality. At the same time I am confident that when we have successfully dispelled the false propaganda and removed the delusion under which the British public are suffering, they with their sense of sagacity and the British politicians and Government, who are capable of handling big issues in a statesmanlike manner, will not fail to meet us; and they are

sufficiently versatile to grasp the issues. If the Muslim India is united and determined and carries on a vigorous propaganda to dispell the misconceptions that have been sedulously created so far, we are bound to succeed

The conception of unity that the Congress High Command are preaching and hanging on to it, is due to unworthy selfishness and is based on mean strategy. It is calculated and rests on the hope of exploitation of British ignorance of Indian conditions, and in fact, they look to the British arms for the realisation and establishment of the Hindu Raj in this country, but it is unthinkable that the British arms can ever be placed at the disposal of the Congress High Command to dominate Muslim India. This attempt at gamble on the part of the Congress is bound to fail and their hopes and aspirations in this direction have already been, to a certain extent, frustrated.

It is amazing that men like Mr Gandhi and Mr Rajagopalachariar should talk about the Lahore Resolution in such terms as "division of India" and "cutting the baby into two halves. Surely, today India is divided and partitioned by Nature. Muslim India and Hindu India exist on the physical map of India. I fail to see why there is this hue and cry. Where is the country which is being divided? Where is the nation which is denationalised? India is composed of nationalities, to say nothing about the castes and subcastes. Where is the Central National Government, whose authority is being violated?

India is held by the British Power and that is the hand that holds and gives the impression of united India and the unitary Government. Indian nation and central government do not exist. It is only the convenient imagination of the Congress High Command. It is a pure intellectual and mental luxury, in which some of the Hindu leaders have been indulging so recklessly.

We are told that our demand is the quintessence of communalism. Why? Because we propose that the Hindus and Mussalmans should be provided with their homelands which will enable them to live side by side as two honourable nations, and as good neighbours and not Hindus as superior and Mussalmans as inferior nations, tied artificially together with a Hindu religious majority to dominate and rule over Muslim India.

We are told next that we may develop extra territorial affinity Surely, when we have constituted our national homelands and developed our territorial sovereign government it is unthinkable that we shall not guard our frontiers, just as in the middle exist territorial Muslim States side by side Next we are told that the scheme is impracticable, but the autonomous provinces are in existence, even under the present constitution where the Mussalmans and the Hindus dominate respectively Their reconstitution into geographical, contiguous, homogenous independent zones is a most feasible and practicable scheme provided it is honestly examined But this agreement can only emanate with the one and the only motive and desire on the part of the Congress to coerce the Muslim India to submit to a central government with the Hindu majority and Hindu rule throughout the country Our proposal is more practical than 'Ahimsa' and 'Charkha', or for the matter of that, the ideal of Ram Raj or Swaraj and complete independence of Mr Gandhi's conception

Further it is not detrimental either to the Hindu or Muslim interests generally, and so far as the minorities are concerned in the respective zones they will be given safeguards which will be effective, adequate and mandatory It is the only practical solution of not only communal but political problems confronting us Both the nations would be in a position then to enjoy equal status, rights and privileges, free to develop their spiritual economic, social and political life according to their own sentiments, culture conditions and genius

Lastly it has been said that it is not in the interest of the Mussalmans themselves Surely, that must be left to the self-determination of Muslim India It is the same old hackneyed argument that our rulers have often advanced when all else has failed them whenever we have pressed our demands It does not come with any grace from the Congress High Command or the Congress Press

Why talk of the civil war in connection with the League Resolution? It is highly mischievous There will be no conflict and should be no conflict unless the Congress desires it There can be no chaos and confusion unless Mr Gandhi uses all his forces of non-violent methods to obstruct the achievement of the Muslim ideal Our ideals presuppose Indian freedom and independence, and we shall achieve India's independence far more quickly by agreeing to the underlined principles of the Lahore Resolution than by any other method

In his latest article which appeared in the press on the 19th of May, Mr Gandhi says, "Should it happen otherwise and partition becomes the fashion, either we shall have partition or partitions rather than foreign rule, or we shall continue to wrangle among ourselves and submit to foreign rule, or else have a proper civil war" It is quite clear from this that Mr Gandhi understands or ought to understand that to wrangle over the imaginary one and united India can only result in our submission to foreign rule I pray that Mr Gandhi's prophecy of "proper civil war" will not come, but the better minds of Hindus and Mussalmans will come round to the only alternative embodied in the Lahore Resolution

In conclusion I appeal to the conference to organise the Mussalmans and prepare ourselves by creating complete harmony and unity amongst us so that we may be ready to face any emergency, as and when it may arise

The issues involve the future fate and destiny of ninety millions of Mussalmans and I am sure that Muslim India today is fully alive to the gravity of the situation both internal and external that is facing us Our ideal and our fight is not to harm or injure any other community or interest or block the progress but to defend ourselves We want to live in this country honourable life as free men and we stand for free Islam and free India

An article written by Mr. M A Jinnah for "TIME and TIDE"
dated the 19th January 1940

The constitutional maladies from which India at present suffers may best be described as symptoms of a disease inherent in the body-politic. Without diagnosing the disease, no understanding of the symptoms is possible and no remedy can suggest itself. Let us, therefore first diagnose the disease, then consider the symptoms and finally arrive at the remedy.

What is the political future of India? The declared aim of the British Government is that India should enjoy Dominion Status in accordance with the Statute of Westminster in the shortest practicable time. In order that this end should be brought about, the British Government, very naturally, would like to see in India the form of democratic constitution it knows best and thinks best, under which the Government of the country is entrusted to one or other political party in accordance with the turn of the elections.

Such however is the ignorance about Indian conditions among even the members of the British Parliament that, in spite of all the experience of the past it is even yet not realized that this form of Government is totally unsuited to India. Democratic systems based on the concept of a homogeneous nation such as England are very definitely not applicable to heterogeneous countries such as India, and this simple fact is the root cause of all of India's constitutional ills.

Even as Under-Secretary of State for India the late Lt-Col Muirhead failed to appreciate this fact for deploring the present communal tension, he expressed the opinion that the tendency on the part of both, those in power and those in opposition, was to consider that what the position now was would be the position always. He deplored the failure of Indians to appreciate an essential feature of democratic Government—namely, the majority and the minority are never permanent, and he therefore, felt that the minorities' opposition to Federation on the assumption that from the outset power would be in the hands of an irremovable majority was untenable. But he forgot that the whole concept of democracy postulates a single people, divided how-

ever much economically, and he might well have started his study of Indian problems by consulting the report of the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms (Sessions 1933-34 Vol 1 para 1)

"India is inhabited by many races often as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe Two thirds of its inhabitants profess Hinduism in one form or another as their religion, over 77 millions are followers of Islams, and the difference between the two is not only of religion in the stricter sense but also of law and culture They may be said, instead, to represent two distinct and separate civilizations Hinduism is distinguished by the phenomenon of its caste, which is the basis of its religious and social system, and, save in a very restricted field, remains unaffected by contact with the philosophies of the West, the religion of Islam, on the other hand, is based upon the conception of equality of man"

Perhaps no truest description of India has been compressed into a paragraph, and, without this background, no understanding of Indian problems is possible The British people must realize that Hinduism and Islam 'represent two distinct and separate civilizations' and moreover, are 'as distinct from one another in origin tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe"

They are in fact two different nations, and if this fact is accepted by no less an authority than the Joint Select Committee, the Muslim people have cause to question the wisdom of the British Government in forcing on India the Western system of democracy without the qualifications and limitations to which the system must be subject to make it at all suitable for Indian conditions

If, therefore, it is accepted that there is in India a major and a minor nation, it follows that a parliamentary system based on the majority principle must inevitably mean the rule of the major nation Experience has proved that, whatever the economic and political programme of any political party, the Hindu, as a general rule will vote for his caste-fellow and the Muslim for his co-religionist

The British people, being Christians, sometimes forget the religious wars of their own history and today consider religion as a private and personal matter between man and God This can never be the case in Hinduism and Islam, for both these religions are definite social codes

which govern, not so much man's relation with his God, as man's relation with his neighbour. They govern not only his law and culture but every aspect of his social life, and such religions, essentially exclusive, completely preclude that merging of identity and unity of thought, on which Western democracy is based, and inevitably bring about vertical rather than the horizontal divisions that democracy envisages.

Western democracy is totally unsuited for India and its imposition on India is the disease in the body politic let us now consider the inevitable symptoms.

Led by an astute Hindu politician of the first rank, Mahatma Gandhi, the Congress (which is mainly a Hindu body) had long foreseen that in the Western form of democracy lay the fulfilment of their hopes of permanent All-India dominance. All their efforts and energies had, therefore, been bent towards securing for India a completely democratic form of Government, and they realized that the new constitution would bring their goal immeasurably nearer if it could be worked on lines chalked out by their leader and the Working Committee.

Therefore while crying that new constitution was thoroughly unsatisfactory and totally unacceptable the Congress decided to contest the elections held before its inauguration and as was inevitable, secured complete majorities in the six Hindu provinces of India namely, Bombay, Madras, U P, Bihar and Orissa. The Congress however was as completely defeated in the five Muslim provinces namely Bengal, the Punjab, Sind, the North-West-Frontier Province and Assam and even in the Hindu provinces failed to capture any appreciable number of seats in non-Hindu constituencies particularly Muslim electorates.

This undoubtedly was an unsatisfactory situation for a self-styled 'national' party and the exposure of its communal character seemed imminent. Rushing to Wardha for guidance the Working Committee took stock. What was the position? In five provinces they had been defeated and while they held a complete majority in six, the Oppositions weak in numbers though they were, were led by the small but solid blocks of Muslim League members.

This situation had two very unsatisfactory aspects. First, it brought out the completely Hindu composition of the Congress and secondly, it would be difficult to ignore and override Muslim led Opposi-

tions as long as the Governors of provinces were in possession of special powers granted to safeguard minority interests

Realizing at once that such circumstance would considerably, hinder their plans, the Congress played its trump card. It refused to accept office. To the consternation of the Muslims and other minorities, overnight, the Viceroy and the Governors, became suppliant. What would the Congress have them do? What assurances did the Congress need? The answer was ready "Give us the undertaking that you will not exercise your special powers, and we will accept office". Hastily, the constitutional guardians of minority and other rights jettisoned their trust, and amidst much mutual appreciation of each other's "statesmanship", the Congress and the British Government came into political alliance.

But there was still that troublesome first point. The whole game would be up if purely Hindu Government took office, and in at least three of the six provinces not a single Muslim had been returned on the Congress ticket, and not more than one or two in the others. But what of it? Surely there must be at least one amongst the Muslim Members who would be unable to resist the bait of a ministership. They would offer the Ministership provided he signed the Congress pledge.

But would the Governor agree to this "camouflage"? What did his instrument of instructions advise? "In making appointments to his Council of Ministers our Governor shall use his best endeavour to select his Ministers in the following manner, that is to say, in consultation with the person who in his judgment is likely to command a stable majority in the legislature to appoint those persons (including, so far as practicable, members of important minority communities) who will best be in a position collectively to command the confidence of the legislature. But in so acting he shall bear constantly in mind the need of fostering a sense of joint responsibility among his Ministers."

Anxiously the Working Committee analysed the implications. The instructions seemed to be in two parts. In the first the Governors were instructed to use 'his best endeavours to select' as Ministers "persons (including, as far as practicable, members of important minority communities)". The spirit underlying these words was clear. It was to secure for important minorities a Minister who commanded their confidence, and since there was no difference in the political programmes

of the Congress and Muslim League Parties in the legislatures, there was no reason why it was not "practicable" for a Muslim League member to be appointed a Minister

But what about the last line 'But in so acting he shall bear in mind the need for fostering a sense of joint responsibility among his Ministers?' This, fortunately, could be turned to suit their purpose if the Governor was prepared to allow this second part, advisory and subsidiary to the main instruction, to overrule the first.

They had but to claim that joint responsibility was impossible unless the Muslim Minister was prepared to abide by the decisions of the Working Committee, and their point was won. Meekly the Governors acquiesced and in order to allow the Congress to deceive the public by making it appear that it was "national", and looking after the interests of the minorities by including a "representative" of them in the Council of Ministers, accepted as Muslim Ministers individuals who by no stretch of imagination could be regarded as "representatives" of the Muslim community and who by signing the Congress pledge, were responsible to Working Committee alone

Surprised by such easy victories, the Congress became intoxicated with power. The Working Committee arrogated to itself the position of a parallel Central Government to whom the Provincial Governments were responsible. Regional dictators were appointed and the ministers were entirely subject to their orders generally and no provincial legislation could be enacted without their approval. They then proceeded to stifle even the little opposition that existed. Having dealt with the British, they now dealt with the Muslims

An India-wide attack on the Muslims was launched. In the five Muslim provinces every attempt was made to defeat the Muslim led coalition Ministries, and by offering local political inducements, Congress Ministries came into power in at least two more provinces, the N. W. F. P. and Assam.

In the six Hindu provinces a "Kulturkampf", was inaugurated. Attempts were made to have *Bande Mataram*, the Congress Party song, recognised as the national anthem, the party flag, recognised as National flag and the real national language, Urdu, supplanted by Hindi. Everywhere oppression commenced and complaints poured in such force into

the Muslim League's Central Office that the Pirpur Committee, whose report is available, was appointed to investigate these grievances. Such overwhelming evidence was collected that the Muslims, despairing of the Viceroy and the Governors ever taking action to protect them, have lately been forced to ask for a Royal Commission to investigate their grievances.

Such was the position on the eve of the resignation of the Congress Ministries, a position over which the British people might well ponder. Is it their desire that India should become a totalitarian Hindu State, with the Central and all the Provincial Governments responsible not to their legislatures or to the electorate but to a caucus unknown to the constitution—the Working Committee of the Congress? They may be rest assured that such will be the inevitable result if the Congress demand for the right of framing India's constitution through a Constituent Assembly is conceded.

Let us consider briefly the implications of this nebulous and impracticable Constituent Assembly. To commence with, the question arises, why is this demand made at this particular time? The answer is obvious. The war is to the Working Committee a heaven-sent means of increasing its rule from over eight provinces to over the whole of India, State and Province. If the British Government are stampeded and fall into the trap under stress of the critical situation created by the war, India will face a crisis the result of which no man could prophesy, and I feel certain that Muslim India will never submit to such a position and will be forced to resist it with every means in their power.

And of what type of constitutionalist will this Constituent Assembly consist? There are in India roughly 400 million souls who, through no fault of their own, are hopelessly illiterate and consequently, priest and caste ridden. They have no real conception of how they are being governed even today, and it is proposed that to the elected representatives of such, should India's future constitution be entrusted. Is it too much to say that since the vast majority of the elected representatives will be illiterate Hindus, the Constituent Assembly will be under the influence of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress leaders, and the constitution that will emerge will be as the Working Committee directs?

Thus, through the Constituent Assembly will the Working Committee attain its ends. British control and commerce will disappear,

the Indian States will be abolished ! Minority oppositon will be stifled and a great Hindu nation will emerge, governed by its beloved leader, Mahatma Gandhi, and the Congress Working Committee

We have now considered the disease and the symptoms What is the remedy ?

(1) The British people must realize that unqualified Western democracy is totally unsuited for India and attempts to impose it must cease

(2) In India it must be accepted that "party" Government is not suitable and all Governments Central or Provincial must be Governments that represent all sections of the people

In this connection the All-India Muslim League has laid down the following broad principles

(1) That the British Government should review and revise the entire problem of India's future constitution *de novo* in the light of the experience gained by the working of the present provincial constitution, and developments that have taken place since 1939 or which may take place hereafter

(2) While the Muslim League stands for a Free India, it is irrevocably opposed to any Federal objective which must necessarily result in a majority community rule, under the guise of Democracy and a Parliamentary system of Government

(3) No declaration regarding the question of constitutional advance for India should be made without the consent and approval of the All-India Muslim League, nor any constitution be framed and finally adopted by His Majesty's Government and the British Parliament without such consent and approval

To conclude, a constitution must be evolved that recognizes that there are in India, two nations who both must share the governance of their common motherland

In evolving such a constitution, the Muslims are ready to co-operate with the British Government, the Congress or any party so that the present enmities may cease and India may take its place amongst the great countries of the world

Partition Way To India's Freedom

An earnest appeal to the better minds of the Hindus and other communities to give serious consideration to the Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League is made by Mr. Mohammed Ali Jinnah in a statement to the press on 1st April 1940.

Bait to Muslim Minorities

Replying to the critics of the League's resolution Mr Jinnah says, "in the first place, a wrong idea and false propaganda appear to be to set in motion, in order to frighten the Muslim minorities that they would have to migrate *en bloc* and wholesale. I wish to assure my Muslim brethren that there is no justification for this insidious misrepresentation.

"Exchange of population, however, on the physical division of India, as far as practicable, will have to be considered.

"Secondly, the Muslim minorities are wrongly made to believe that they would be worse off and be left in the lurch in any scheme of partition or division of India. I may explain that the Mussalmans, wherever they are in a minority, cannot improve their position under a United India or under one Central Government. Whatever happens they would remain a minority. They can rightly demand all the safeguards that are known to any civilised government to the utmost extent. But by coming in the way of the division of India, they do not and cannot improve their own position. On the other hand, they can, by their attitude of obstruction, bring the Muslim homeland and six crores of the Mussalmans under one government, where they would remain no more than a minority in perpetuity.

Some Old Problems Again

"It was because of the realisation of this fact that Mussalman minorities in the Hindu India readily supported the Lahore resolution. The question for the Muslim minorities in the Hindu India is, whether the entire Muslim India of nine crores should be subjected to a Hindu majority raj or whether at least the six crores of the Mussalmans

residing in the areas where they form a majority should have their own home land, and thereby have an opportunity to develop their spiritual, cultural, economic and political life, in accordance with their own genius, and shape their own future destiny, at the same time allowing Hindus and others to do likewise. Similar will be the position of the Hindus and other minorities in the Muslim homelands. In my opinion, after the present tension created by the ambition of one community dominating over the other and establishing supremacy over all the rest is eased, we shall find better understanding and goodwill created all-round. The division of India will throw a great responsibility upon the majority in its respective zones to create a real sense of security amongst the minorities and win their complete trust and confidence.

Wooing The Sikhs

Mr Jinnah next dealt with the apprehensions created amongst the Sikhs by the Lahore resolution and said 'I always have had an admiration and respect for the Sikh community and I want my Sikh friends to study thoroughly the constitutional problem of India as it stands to-day. I am sure that they would be much better off in the North-West Muslim Zone than they can ever possibly be in a United India or under one Central Government for, under one Central Government their voice would be negligible. The Punjab in any case, would be an autonomous sovereign unit. And after all, they have to live in the Punjab. It is obvious that whereas in a United India they would be mere nobodies in the Muslim Homeland constituted of the Western Zone of the Federated Autonomous States, including the Autonomous Sovereign State of the Punjab, the Sikhs would always occupy an honoured place and would play an effective and influential rôle."

Pakistan and Indian States

Dealing with the Indian States, Mr Jinnah said "the only important states which matter, are not in the Eastern, but in the North Western Zone. They are Kashmir, Bahawalpur, Patiala, etc. If these States willingly agree to come into the federation of Muslim Homeland we shall be glad to come to a reasonable and honourable settlement with them. We have, however, no desire to force them or coerce them in any way."

Relations with Britain

In regard to the relationship of the Muslim Homeland with Great Britain Mr Jinnah referred to the Lahore resolution which said "This session authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs communications customs and such other matters as may be necessary " Continuing, Mr Jinnah said "as regards other zone or zones, that may be constituted in the rest of India, our relationship will be of an international character An example already exists in the relationship of India with Burma and Ceylon "

Reply To Congress Critics

Proceeding Mr Jinnah said ' One set of criticisms has come from some of the Congressite Mussalmans Obviously they are speaking in their master's voice, and I do not think anyone need worry about it

' As to the criticism of some of the Congress leaders, it is a parrot-like cry and thoughtless The only person who has made any serious attempt to criticise the Lahore resolution is Mr Rajagopalachariar He, however, judges others by his own standards of political integrity when he said that we mean what we do not say, namely, "what Mr Jinnah desires is a fuller amplitude for the so-called Muslim provinces to work out their progress without being hampered by a Central Government working under conditions necessitated by the composition of India's population and the play of political forces at such a centre Surely, he can ask for many things other than the cutting up of India into two parts, based on a medieval conception in order to attain this laudable desire "

Mr Rajagopalachariar's arguments of dividing the baby and the parable of King Solomon is gone beyond the zenith of his intellectual powers This analogy he wants to apply to our proposals

Surely, India is not the sole property of the Congress, and if the real mother was to be discovered, it would be the Dravidians and still further the Aborigines It would neither be the Aryan nor the Mussalman The Aryan claim to India is no better than that of the Mussalmans, except that they were earlier arrivals in point of time What, however, is most astounding is Mr Rajagopalachariar's talk when he says "Indeed not

even Tipu Sultan or Hydarali or Aurangzeb or Akbar, all of whom lived during days when differences seemed more deep rooted than now, imagined that India was anything but one and indivisible. These great men might have differed from one another in many respects, but they agreed in looking upon this precious land and this great nation as one and essentially indivisible", 'yes, naturally they did so, as conquerers and parental rulers. Is this the kind of Government Mr. Rajagopalachariar does still envisage?' and did the Hindus of those days willingly accept the rule of these 'great men'?

I may or may not be suffering from a diseased mentality, but the statement of Mr. Rajagopalachariar and his criticisms of the Lahore resolution indicate that in him, there is no mind left at all. I hope he does not 'represent the true Hindu opinion, and I doubt very much whether he represents the opinion of the Congress or its High Command so far as his statement on Lahore resolution goes" - A. P.

Protection Versus Separation

Alternatives Before Muslims in Independent India.

By M R T in 'The Eastern Times' January 5, 1940

The most important political question before a Muslim is whether his interests can best be served by an assurance of 'full protection of his religion, culture and language' on the part of the Congress, or a complete separation and independence of those parts of India where Muslims form a majority

If the first alternative is accepted the 80 millions of Muslims will once for all be reduced to the position of a minority and will have to depend upon the good will and amity of the majority community for the protection of their interests

Muslims in North-West and North-East

Now no one would object to this result if the Muslim population of India had actually been scattered in all the provinces and had not been strong enough to form an independent stable government in any part. But as facts stand two-thirds of the Muslim population in India is concentrated in their majority provinces and one-third in minority provinces. They number 28 millions in the North-West out of a total population of 42 millions in the five adjoining areas of the Punjab, Kashmir, Sind, the Frontier Province and Baluchistan. This proportion of Muslim population can further be raised by a readjustment of the eastern frontier of the Punjab.

If Ambala Division and Eastern Hindu and Sikh States are excluded from the Punjab, its population will be reduced from 28½ millions at present to 21 millions but the Muslim percentage will be raised from 55 at present to 70. This Muslim percentage will further be raised if the entire Muslim North-West is taken together as a whole. With the eastern frontier modified as proposed, the North-West will have a total population of 35 millions of which Muslims will number 27 millions and non-Muslims 8 millions. The Muslim proportion of 77 per cent will be strong enough to ensure a permanent stable government, and this result

will be achieved without having recourse to any scheme of exchange of population

Bengal and Assam

The Muslims are also a majority of 55 per cent in Bengal where they number 27½ millions out of 50 millions. There is no single Muslim country in any other part of the world except the island of Java, where the Muslim population reaches such a high figure. The Muslim population of Bengal is double that of Turkey, Persia or Egypt taken separately,

In Bengal, too, like the Punjab, a readjustment of frontiers will raise the Muslim proportion in population to 80 per cent or more. At present the Muslims form an overwhelming majority of 75 per cent in Eastern Bengal and the Goalpara and Sylhet districts of Assam. They are also a majority in some districts of Western Bengal which are contiguous to Eastern Bengal. If this Muslim population is formed together so as to come under a new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, the Muslims will be placed in a permanent majority of 80 per cent in a total population of 40 millions.

Independence, Real Goal for Muslim Areas

If final independence is the goal of India, and severance of the British connection is considered a possibility in some future date, the Muslims have every right to demand a full and equal share in the distribution of ultimate political power of India. It is for them to judge whether their interests can better be served by remaining a minority under a future Indian Government or by forming independent sovereign states in the North West and North-East, where they constitute compact areas with distinct geographical limits. The lure of a united Indian nation can only tempt them if it can really serve their interests. No high-sounding idealism can divert them from their real object if in the long run it is going to affect their interests adversely.

Conflict of Political Interests

It is needless for me to remind here that Hindus and Muslims do not represent mere religious majorities and minorities: they are also politically, economically and socially divided. The Muslim has distinct political aspirations which urge him on to the political regeneration of his own community as well as of the Muslim world in general. He does not view

with the same interest the progress of non-Muslim countries as he watches that of a Muslim country. His first concern is with the rise of Islam as a political power in the world. This ambition he conceives, not with a view to suppress the liberties of other nations, but simply because he feels that the establishment of the political power of Islam will bring about a better standard of justice and equality between nations and individuals.

He still believes that if Islam had been the dominant religion in Europe, the world would not have seen the rise of a narrow and aggressive form of nationalism which has dragged the whole world into a state of chaos and disorder.

Associations in the Past

The Hindu, on the other hand, has no ultra-territorial interests. All his activities are confined to India and he has no real cultural or religious link with any other country beyond India. The fate of China or Japan cannot be of such interest to a Hindu as that of Turkey or Afghanistan to a Muslim.

Differences in political aspirations in the past, when Muslims and Hindus assumed the role of the rulers and the ruled, have further deepened the political divergence of the two communities. The Muslim still looks with fervour to his glorious past and is only interested in independence in so far as it can assist him directly in regaining the political power lost by him. The Hindu, too breathes deep in the ancient past when he dominated the continent of India and enjoyed undivided political power.

Conflict of Economic Interest

Economically, too, there is a clash between Hindu and Muslim interests. There are certain occupations entirely reserved for Hindus and the Muslims have been completely shut out of them. Shop-keeping in general is a monopoly of the Hindu even in purely Muslim areas. The grain and cloth markets in particular in every city are controlled by Hindus. Even in villages which lie in pure Muslim surroundings, the Hindu holds a favoured position as a money-lender or shopkeeper. The Muslim middle class in cities has no choice left except to work as labourers or to seek petty jobs in Government service. The Hindu middle

class is prosperous and flourishing and controls all the internal and external trade of the country

The Muslims cannot look upon this state of affairs as a *fait accompli*. Nor can they accept for ever the condition of being a debtor community. All their hard-earned savings passed into the hands of the Hindu money-lender in the form of the interest, which in the Punjab alone is ten times the land revenue of the Province.

"Peaceful Penetration" of Hindus

Another danger to which Muslims are exposed is the peaceful penetration of the Hindu shop-keeper in purely Muslim areas. The Hindu has no landed interests in the Western Punjab, the Frontier Province and Sind, and yet he forms a majority in all the towns and dominates the entire public life. This is all due to the fact that the Hindu was the first to gain by the spread of British rule in India while the Muslim, who has lost all political power, has still not been in a position to accommodate himself to changed circumstances.

This alone accounts for the fact that in a city like Bannu which lies in the heart of a Muslim district, the Hindus form over 70 per cent of its population and monopolise the entire trade and all the professions. Of the 2,000 odd shops in the city, there are hardly a dozen Muslim shops.

Punjab Muslims Parallel with Turks

The economic condition of the Muslims in the Punjab is exactly like that of the Turks in their homeland of Asia Minor prior to the inauguration of Modern Turkey. Though the Turk had ruled over Asia Minor for over 800 years, and formed the majority of its population, yet economically he stood no comparison with the subject peoples like the Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. All internal and foreign trade and all the learned professions, such as medicine, teaching and banking, were monopolised by non-Turkish races. The Turk, like the Punjabi Muslim, was either a peasant sunk deep in debt or was content to work as a soldier or a Government servant.

Nothing but a revolution was needed to change the economical condition of the Turks. This was accomplished by Mustapha Kemal, who banned almost all professions to Jews, Armenians and Greeks.

stopped the latter's further immigration into purely Turkish villages and cities and started with State help various commercial enterprises to encourage the Turk to undertake banking and trading. Now in course of 25 years the Turk is commercially most efficient in his homeland, and the Turkish peasant is no longer in the grips of the Armenian or Jewish moneylender.

Under Congress Raj

Can we expect this of a future Indian Government under Congress domination—that it will try to bring the Muslims into line with the Hindu community, which at present holds the sole monopoly of trade and commerce in cities and villages and possesses wealth and influence out of all proportion to its numerical strength? The interests of the Muslim peasant as well as of the Muslim middle class man in the city directly clash with those of the Hindu money lender and shop-keeper. The Muslim cannot trust that the very community, which is at present responsible for their economic enslavement, will do justice to them the moment it gains political power. On the contrary these fears are intensified by the realisation that a concentration of political and economic power in the hands of a hostile community will make their condition politically and economically worse than at present.

Divergence in Social Systems

Socially Hindus and Muslims present two entirely different systems. The Hindu is caste-ridden and believes in certain social customs and practices which have become engrained in his daily life by the lapse of centuries. High-caste Hindu cannot dine or marry in a low-caste Hindu family. Modern education has no doubt taught the Hindu to protect the interests of Harijans and depressed classes but still he is not prepared to assign an equal status to the latter. He is still opposed to separate electorates and safeguards for Harijans and recognises no special privileges or rights for them except what they can claim as part of the Hindu Polity.

Now it is common knowledge that the working of Hindu social system in the past has led to the concentration of all economic and social power in the hands of high-caste Hindus. This cannot be said of Islam. The Muslims believe in the equality and fraternity of all. Inter-dining and inter-marriage are not obstacles among the various

classes of Muslims They believe in the equality of all before law and recognise no distinction between one Muslim and another on the basis of birth and blood

Social Gathering

Such indeed is the divergence in the social systems of the two communities that on occasions of common social gathering when those differences are expected to be minimised, they present themselves in more striking forms A Muslim attending a Hindu public dinner or party will miss badly, things suited to his taste and will find most of the dishes prepared according to Hindu practice In a railway journey, when opportunities of contact are of daily occurrence, the question of food and drink still divides the Hindu from the Muslim In cities in building a new house or taking an old one on rent a Hindu will more readily see the company of a Hindu neighbour In fact in every walk of life, a Muslim is more welcome to a Muslim and a Hindu to a Hindu

Real Solution of the Problem

In view of this conflict of interest in the political, economic and social field besides that of religion it is not an easy task to reconcile the interests of a Muslim to those of Hindu nationalism which aims at the possession of supreme control of all political power of India Protection of religion language and culture is out of the question where a minority can be easily converted into a permanent majority by a readjustment of geographical frontiers

Undoubtedly the Muslims in Hindu-majority provinces are a real minority and have no other alternative but to accept Congress assurances of good will for their future but they are not bound by any such consideration to leave their ultimate political and economic interests in provinces where they are a majority, to the mercy of a hostile Hindu majority at the Centre

Muslim Opposition to Congress Nationalism

The question is often asked, if Muslim interests are safeguarded in their minority provinces and are already protected in their majority provinces by their own preponderant numerical strength, why do they not accept the lead of the Congress and its ideal of a common Indian nationality? The answer to this question requires a real understanding

of what is meant by independence. When a nation aspires for independence, it seeks to have full power to decide all questions affecting the multifarious activities of a modern State. It does not simply want self-government as understood in a limited sense, but supreme control of all national organs of the State including defence, foreign affairs, finance, communications, etc.

Majority Rule at Centre

Now it is a simple conclusion that if the Muslim Provinces remain part of a future Indian National State, they will undoubtedly enjoy a limited kind of provincial autonomy but the final voice in the army, navy, air force and other important central subjects will be that of a Central Cabinet responsible to a Central Legislature which will be dominated by a Hindu Majority. Unless the Muslims are assured of some special advantages which they will obtain if they remain content with limited provincial autonomy in their majority provinces, there is no other consideration which can persuade or compel them to accept the majority rule at the centre.

In fact, the Muslims are convinced that by forming part of single composite nation in India they will be losers all round and will finally sink to the position of a helpless minority which will be shorn of all final power in the supreme executive affairs of the Centre. It is for the Congress to convince the Muslims how they are going to benefit by a Hindu domination at the Centre.

Arguments Against Separation

The arguments so far advanced against the proposed scheme of separation have been unconvincing. It is said that the proposed Muslim States in the North-West and North-East will be cut off from one another by Hindu India and will be in permanent danger of opposition from the latter due to its immense power in men and resources. Secondly, the Muslim States will not be in a position to find money to defend their frontiers and will break down under military pressure from the Frontier tribes or countries beyond the Frontier. Thirdly, the Muslim States will not be able to develop themselves industrially as Hindu capital will not find an easy access in them. Finally the non-Muslim minorities will be a source of constant trouble to Muslim States.

and will ever be on the look out for a favourable opportunity to secede from them

Military Traditions

I reply these arguments one by one. As to the first that the Muslim States will be helpless against Hindu India which will isolate them from each other the simple reply is that mere numbers do not count in the defence of a modern State. The fate of China with its teeming population of 400 millions is a clear instance in point. So far as military traditions go Muslim areas particularly the provinces of the North West are far stronger than Hindu India. This fact is even admitted by Mr. Gandhi who says in a recent article in the *Harijan* that if the British leave India to day the Punjabis and Gurkhas will overrun the country. Besides the Muslim States will enter into a permanent alliance with other Muslim countries of South Western Asia and will thus preserve the balance of power evenly between Hindu India and Muslim States.

The second argument that the proposed Muslim States will be financially poor to defend their frontiers ignores the fact that the North West Frontier will lose all importance once a Muslim State is established in the North West. The tribesmen and the people beyond the North West Frontier are all Muslims. They will lose all religious and political fervour for Jihad against non Muslims once they find that they have to reckon with their brothers in Islam. If the frontier between Afghanistan and Persia or that between Persia and Turkey can be easily defended by comparatively small armies there is no reason why the same should not be possible in case of the frontiers between Afghanistan and Muslim North West.

Again the resources of the new Muslim State in men and money will be far stronger than those of Afghanistan or independent tribes beyond the Frontier Province and hence it will experience no great difficulty in keeping peace and order on its side of the frontier.

Industrial Development

The third argument that the Muslim States will require capital from Hindu India to be developed industrially is entirely wrong. A modern country which can maintain peace and order within its

bounds and can guarantee payment of debt can invite capital from foreign countries. The example of Turkey can be easily followed. If the State Government in Turkey can patronise and finance industries with the help of foreign capital the Muslim States in India can adopt similar methods.

The Muslims do not want that they should lose the major share of profits in business by leaving all initiative and control in industrial development to Hindu capitalists of Hindu India. They will rather prefer that the State should organise and promote industries and find work for the large number of workless people in cities and villages.

Non-Muslim Minorities

The fourth argument that the non-Muslim minorities will be a source of constant danger to the stability of Muslim States will lose all importance in face of the preponderance of Muslim voice in the Government. Both in the North-West and the North-East with adjustments in frontiers the proportion of the Muslim population will be raised to 80 per cent and the minorities will be reduced to 20 per cent. These minorities will be given full protection in regard to their religion, language and culture like the Muslim minorities in Hindu India and will no longer cause unnecessary annoyance to Muslim governments for fear of provoking Muslim minorities in Hindu India to similar action.

As a matter of fact the existence of minorities both in Hindu India and Muslim States will make it possible for them to adopt a common line of action and to restore confidence among the minorities which will thus be finally reconciled to their lot.

Nationalism Is No Solution Of Hindu-Muslim Problem

By M R T in The Eastern Times Febr 16-1940

Mr Gandhi in a recent article in the "Harijan" criticises Mr Jinnah thus 'His picture of India as a continent containing nations counted according to their religions, if it is realised, would undo the effort the Congress has been making for over half a century But I hope that Qaide-Azam Jinnah's opinion is a temporary phase in the history of the Muslim League Muslims of the different provinces can never cut themselves away from their Hindu or Christian brethren But Muslims and Christians are converts from Hinduism or are descendents of converts They do not cease to belong to their provinces because of change of faith Englishmen who become converts to Islam do not change their nationality"

A close and careful study of the above, leads a Muslim to think that Mr Gandhi and other Congress nationalists of his view, always have in their mind the Western type of nationalism, which does not exist in India and which the Muslims will never accept

Nationalism, pure and simple of the Western brand is a creation of special circumstances in Europe which presuppose the existence of a homogeneous people within the bounds of a country It has proved a disruptive force in countries which have several distinct national groups The Austro-Hungarian Turkish, and Russian Empires before the last great War were such countries with different nationalities The growth of nationalism instead of binding together and unifying these countries, weakened them and was finally responsible for their break up

Austria-Hungary

In Austria-Hungary, where the people were allied together by a common religion, being Roman Catholics, and had lived together in peace and amity as members of a common empire, which in the past had acted as a strong bulwark for Christendom against the rising tide of the Turk, the growth of nationalism hastened the movement for separation. In

vain the House of Hapsburg the then oldest reigning dynasty of Europe, had attempted to fuse the various peoples into a common national whole

Common religion common system of law, common past traditions, common social customs and above all a common standard of education and culture failed to bring about unity and national consciousness Even the new danger threatening the empire, in the rise of an aggressive Russia in the East with her eyes on her northern provinces, nor again the common economic interests for expansion of trade and promotion of industries could appeal to the people to prefer unity to disintegration

The collapse of the Empire at the end of the Great War gave birth to a tremendous outburst of nationalism among all its national groups Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary and Austria became independent national states, while parts of the Dual Monarchy were merged in the succession States of Poland and Yugo Slavia and the old States of Rumania

It is evident to a student of history that the problem of Austro-Hungarian Empire could be tackled in a different way as well The various national groups could have been federated so as to form a federal State with complete provincial autonomy to federating parts The ground work for this already existed in the very name of the empire which was known as a Dual Monarchy, with Austria and Hungary as its main parts The various peoples Czechs, Slovaks Poles, Croats, Slavonians, Rumanians, Magyars and Germans, all enjoyed a sort of provincial autonomy and were represented in the central parliaments to Vienna and Budapest The empire was united for defence and foreign affairs under the House of Hapsburg but for all other purposes both Austria and Hungary enjoyed complete independence

The advantages for federation far outweighed those for separation, but the various peoples preferred the maxim "Better a bad government by your own people than a good government by other" The people were encouraged in their demand for separation by the principle of self determination which had been accepted in the Versailles Conference for settlement of claims of minorities living in compact areas and capable of forming independent States

Turkey

The Turkish Empire too was a collection of many nationalities Nationalism proved a disruptive force here too In vain did the Young

Turks try to create a national consciousness among the various peoples. They set up a Committee of Union and Progress and promised equal rights to Christians, Jews, and other non-Turkish races.

The movement for unity at first spread among all classes of people. The Jew and the Greek fraternised with the Turk and the first named financed the movement. In the first national parliament of Turkey, the representatives of all religious and racial groups were summoned, and a new constitution was proclaimed which promised protection to religion, language and culture as well as full share in the enjoyment of political and civic rights to Muslims and non-Muslims alike. The experiment however, failed as it was bound to fail.

The Arabs, the Armenians, the Greeks, the Kurds and other minorities kept on intriguing for separation and did not rest content till Turkey had been reduced to its original homeland of Asia Minor where the Turks formed a majority of the population. Here, too, the minority problem confronted Turkey. Besides 6½ million Turks in Asia Minor, there were million each of Greeks, Armenians and Kurds. It was the presence of these minorities that was primarily responsible for the decision of the Allies to hand over Smyrna and its hinterland to Greece and to create an independent state of Armenia in the east. It was not until the Greeks and Armenians had either been driven or exchanged in population that Turkey became a truly homogenous state.

Even now Turkey has to face trouble from time to time in the Eastern border where a million Kurds live.

It is interesting to note here that Pt Jawaharlal Nehru feels sympathy for the poor lot of these Kurds and wishes to see an independent Kurdish state. Beyond India, a Congress nationalist is prepared to support all movements for separation and independence, though they may stand no comparison with a similar movement which the Indian Muslims are sponsoring under Pakistan and other national schemes, but inside India he will deny the existence of any but a single nation.

In a resolution passed by the Bengal Congressites under the guidance of Bose Brothers, the Congress invoked the principle of self-determination as applied in the case of Sudetan Germans and claimed its application for India as a whole. One could easily understand the sympathy of Congress leaders with the Sudetan Germans who persisted in their

separation despite the assurances of full protection of all their political, economic, and cultural rights, but one fails to understand why the Indian Muslims are deprived of the right to determine their future and are being forced to accept the idea of a common nationality. The example of Kurds, whom Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru so much admires for their struggle for independence, all the more inspires Muslims to follow in their wake.

If the Kurds cannot remain content as citizens of Turkey, and continue to press for their independence on religious and national grounds, the Indian Muslim has still greater grounds for justification of his cause. The Kurd is a staunch Muslim and he is mainly opposed to Turkish rule because he considers it irreligious. It is this motive which united the political and religious leaders of the Kurds to rise against Turkey frequently.

Now I quote here from Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru who thus states the Kurdish case in "The Glimpses of World History".

"Out of altogether 30 lacs Kurds nearly half still lived in Turkey proper. A modern nationalist movement had begun there soon after the Young Turk Revolution 1908. Even at the Versailles Peace Conference, Kurdish representatives had demanded national independence.

'It is clear however, that religious orthodoxy had much to do with the rising and it is equally clear that Kurdish nationalism had also much to do with it. Probably the nationalist motive was the strongest.

"Kemal Pasha crushed the Kurds without pity and set up special Tribunals of Independence. The Kurdish leaders, Sh. Said and Doctor Fuad and many others were executed. They died with the plea for the independence of Kurdistan on their lips.

"So the Turks who had recently been fighting for their freedom, crushed the Kurds who sought theirs. It is strange how a defensive nationalism develops into an aggressive one and a fight for freedom becomes one for dominion over others. In 1929 there was a revolt of the Kurds and again it was crushed for the time being at least. But how can one crush for ever, a people who insist on freedom and are prepared to pay the price for it."

This shedding of crocodile tears for the cause of Kurdish independence does not impress an Indian Muslim. The Kurds are an insignificant minority of a million in Turkey, they do not occupy a compact area with distinct geographical limits, they are assured of full political and economic rights in the Turkish State. Their religion and culture stand in no danger in Turkey as the Turks are Muslim by religion.

One thing however is clear. If the movement for Kurdish independence can be termed a modern national movement as Pt Jawaharlal believes it to be, then the separation movement of Indian Muslims is a thousand times more a national movement. The lot of Indian Muslims will be far worse than those of Kurds if they were forced to accept, like the Kurds, the idea of a single composite nationality.

Russia

Now I turn to Russia. Here too, growth of nationalism at first coincided with the policy of Russification which the Czars had encouraged but in course of time disruptive tendencies arose. The peoples on the Western border, Finns, Esthonians, Latvians, Lithuanians and Poles, clamoured for independence and finally succeeded in breaking off on the collapse of the Russian Empire. Those still left on the old Russian Empire, could no longer find any inspiration in the old idea of nationalism and developed a new cult, popularly known as Bolshevism, to unite the heterogeneous elements of the Russian population. In fact the Bolshevik success was entirely due to their open discouragement of nationalism. The new appeal was based upon the common interests of the workers and peasants on all parts of the world.

The present-day Soviet Russia is still not a national State in theory, nor do the various peoples there have any faith in the idea of a single composite nationality as the Congress propagates in India. The Muslims in Turkestan and Trans-Caucasia could never have accepted the Soviet regime if the Bolshevik leaders had laid emphasis on nationalism.

The Soviet Constitution recognises all the national groups, have given them complete provincial autonomy in their respective

arens and has constituted a Council of nationalities in the Centre to safeguard the interest of various groups Further the constitution recognises the right of each group for separation if its interests so demand Despite however the protection of the cultural and economic interests of the various minorities in Russia they are not yet contented

The Muslims who form a national group of 18 millions in Central Asia and are one by language race and religion have been split up into five small Soviet republics to counteract the growth of nationalism and movement for separation among them The Russians still are united under the Russian Federated Republic which claims more than 75 per cent of area and population It is this artificial device which has made the working of Soviet machinery smooth and possible Out of the 11 constituent republics of Soviet Russia six are Muslim republics but these are helpless against the Russian Federated Republic as they have not so far been allowed to merge into a single united republic From the examples of the Austro Hungarian Turkish and Russian Empires it is obvious that nationalism instead of proving a unifying force has been disruptive in its effect The separatists in these countries could not be condemned as being narrow and communal in their outlook nor could the idea of a common nationality be enforced upon them against their wishes

Religion and Nationhood

The lesson of past history is that nationalism has failed to unite a people who are divided by race religion or historic traditions We are most often acquainted with the growth of nationalism on the basis of race or historic traditions and have consequently ignored religion as also one of the decisive forces in forming a nation

Our misunderstanding is primarily due to the fact that the Western nations are all one by religion and are united by a common outlook on life Religion has ceased to be a force for them as it no longer conflicts in their case with other religions

There was however a time when religion was a decisive force in Europe In Spain the Muslims and Christians lived for over

700 years together but they were only welded into a common nation when Muslims had either been forcibly converted or driven out

In the various Balkan States, Muslims and Christians lived together for centuries under Turkish rule but with the rise of modern nationalism Muslims were deprived of all political share in the new States formed and assigned the status of minorities. Similar was the fate of Muslims in Russia

Nationalism in pre-War Russia was understood to mean a national State of Christian Russians who were to dominate the Muslims and Jews as subject people. Europe does not furnish a single example where in the past attempts were ever made by a Christian State to admit the Muslims to equal political rights, even though they were of the same stock and blood as the native Christians were. Thus where Europe has failed despite its professions of liberalism and toleration to furnish a single example of a composite Christian-Muslim State coming into existence, India with its diversity of races, religions and languages has no chance to develop into a national State. Europe missed three clear opportunities of welding together Christian and Muslims in Spain, the Balkan States, and Russia and on each occasion the aggressors were the Christian nationalists who had made nationalism a close preserve of Christianity.

Even now where conflicts of religion are common, nationalism has failed to make its way. The Kurds and Armenians belong to the same stock and speak the same language yet it is religion alone which has kept a dividing line between two communities. The Irish in Roman Catholic Ireland and those in Ulster are only divided into two separate States on account of religion. The Muslim Bulgars in Bulgaria form more than 10 per cent of the population and yet they have not been reconciled with the Christians rule and would even now welcome a return to Turkey if that were possible for them. Thus religion is always the strongest form in determining a national consciousness wherever representatives of two different religions come into contact in a fairly large area and have distinct culture, history and traditions of their own.

Europe for the most part never saw the clash of religions so it was possible for it to develop racial or territorial States. In Southern Europe where the possibility of Christians and Muslims developing into composite nations presented itself, in Spain, the Balkan Peninsula, and parts of Italy, the aggressive wave of Christian nationalism suppressed it once for all, and all Muslim influence was finally extirpated.

Here it is necessary to refute an objection as to whether change of religion implies change of nationality. If nationality is determined by religion, change of religion certainly implies change of nationality. But in a country like England, it is determined by racial and other historic factors, then change of religion may not imply a change of nationality as understood in the West, but it does imply a fundamental change if the new convert is a Muslim.

An Englishman by accepting Islam does find an essential change in his complete outlook on life. He is no longer permitted to intermarry or even inter-dine with his Christian countrymen if he suspects pork being served. He cannot transfer his property to a Christian nor can he support his Government if it carries on a war of aggression against a Muslim State. He has far greater sympathies for Muslims of other parts of the world than even his own relatives who are Christians. He may under necessity be called an Englishman but in reality he is the member of a higher nation, the Islamic Brotherhood which recognises no geographical limits or the bars of colour, race or language.

Mahatma Gandhi is misinformed in supposing that a Muslim can be persuaded or compelled to subordinate the interests of his community, which has a distinct culture and outlook on life, to those of an aggressive kind of nationalism which in practice means the domination of Hindu culture and thought.

In India, there is not merely the clash of religions in the narrow sense of the word, there is clash in every aspect of life, political, social, cultural and economic.

Before closing this article, we quote here from the Simon Commission Report, which thus describes Hindu-Muslim differences

"It would be utter misapprehension to suppose that Hindu-Muslim antagonism is analogous to the separation between religious denominations in contemporary Europe. Differences of race, a different system of law, and the absence of inter-marriage constitute a far more effective barrier. It is a basic opposition manifesting itself at every turn in social custom and economic competition as well as in mutual religious antipathy."

ONE-NATION MYTH EXPOSED

Rejoinder to Mahatma Gandhi's Article in "Harijan"

By M R T in 'The Eastern Times' April, 12 1940

Mr Gandhi in a recent article in the "Harijan" blows cold and hot in the same breath. He admits that "the Muslims must have the same right of self-determination that the rest of India has. We are at present a joint family. Any member may claim a division." His inconsistency, however, becomes apparent when he assumes the role of a high prophet for Muslims and calls the two-nation theory an untruth. To repeat his own words: "But I do not believe that Muslims, when it comes to a matter of actual decision, will even want vivisection. Their good sense will prevent them; their self interest will deter them and their religion will forbid the obvious suicide which partition would mean. The two-nation theory is an untruth." In the end he warns the Muslims against "the untruth that is being propagated amongst them." He says "This warning is a duty, because I have faithfully served them in their hour of need and because Hindu-Muslim unity has been and is my life's ambition."

Religion vs Nationality

In this article an attempt will be made to examine the arguments advanced by Mr Gandhi to prove how far they are based on real facts. The first argument is that "the vast majority of Muslims of India are converts to Islam or are descendents of converts. They did not become a separate nation as soon as they become converts." What Mr Gandhi means to say in plain words is that change of religion does not imply change of nationality. According to him, people observing different religions can remain members of the same nation.

He has, however, lost sight of two important facts. Firstly, the conception in the relations between religion and nationality differs in the East from that in the West. Religion is considered not merely religion, in the strict sense as understood in the West, by a Hindu or a Muslim, but a complete social order which affects all the activities of life. In Islam, religion is the motive spring of all actions in life.

A Muslim of one country has far more sympathies with a Muslim living in another country than with a non Muslim living in the same country

The Prophet of Arabia (blessed be his soul) loved Balal an Ethiopian more than his own kindred who had not yet accepted Islam. Even now an Indian Muslim feels far more stirred by the distress of his Muslim brothers beyond India than by a similar calamity affecting non Muslims in India. This does not imply that Islam teaches indifference towards other religions but it is simply a proof of the brotherhood of Islam wherein all those holding similar views develop an identical interest in the future outlook on life and consequently are moved to feel a genuine sympathy in the welfare of Muslims in general.

Effect of Conversion to Islam

How this force of religion can be exercised in opposition to the idea of nationality can be explained by a typical example. A German nationalist will take pride in the exaltation of his own country and will spare no efforts to advance its interests though they may directly result in doing harm to another country. But if he becomes a convert to Islam and he is true to his religion he will have to modify this conception of nationality so far as his relations are concerned with Muslims. If his country wages a war with a Muslim country for aggressive purposes it shall be his religious duty no matter what the dictates of nationality may demand to oppose his country as far as it lies in his power and to withhold all active support from it. Thus the mere conversion of a German to Islam tremendously affects his relations with the Muslims in general.

Mr Gandhi should know that in cases where there is a conflict between duty towards religion and duty towards nation a Muslim will always prefer the former and discard the role of a nationalist in the broader interests of Islam. A Muslim cannot reconcile his allegiance permanently to the theory of a single nation wherein he is required to merge his identity and lose contact with his religion as a dominating force or with the Muslims in other parts of the world.

Religion Real Basis for Nationality

The second point which Mr Gandhi has ignored is that religion alone is a cohesive force for the idea of nationality. In countries where the allegiance of people is divided on the basis of religion the idea of a

single nationality has never finally succeeded. In Germany, the Christians and Jews have lived together for centuries and yet they have failed to weld together into a single nation. The Nazis have only recently discovered a remedy, by concentrating Jews in a separate homeland in the central part of Poland.

The Muslims and Christians lived together for more than 800 years in Spain and yet the idea of a single nationality could not be developed. It was only when the Muslims had been driven out of the country or had been forcibly converted to Christianity that the modern Spanish nation came into existence.

Very often in the fold of the same religion, marked differences in views have led to the division of a nation into two or more parts. In Ireland the Protestant Ulster men and the Roman Catholic Irishmen do not wish to form a common national State. The Dutch and the Belgians are very small peoples who could easily be united into a single nation but it was mainly the religious differences that led to the final separation of the two countries. The Belgians are Roman Catholic by religion and their neighbours, the Dutch, are Protestants. The present conception of nationality in Europe is really based upon the idea of a common Christian religion.

European Nations are Christian by Religion

Europe has so far not tolerated the government of any other nation unless it be Christian by religion. Islam came into contact with Christians in various parts of Europe and established successful governments in Spain, South Italy and Sicily, the Balkan Peninsula and Southern Russia. So long as the aggressive wave of Christian nationalism was held in abeyance, the Muslims managed to preserve their religion and culture, but with the regeneration of Modern Europe in the 16th century, a general crusade began against Muslim settlers in all parts of Europe. The Pope, as head of the Roman Catholic Church, supported the Spanish Inquisition and other measures for the extirpation of Muslim influence from Europe, while the Czars of Russia as heads of the Greek Catholic Church drove out Muslims from the Southern provinces and exercised a reign of complete tyranny over those Muslims who were still left under Russian rule. In fact the Muslims were never considered as equal in status to Christians and were deprived of the common rights of citizenship. Thus where Christian Europe has failed,

in spite of its professions of liberalism, to evolve a common nationality with Muslims or Jews, how can the Muslims trust, in face of this bitter experience of the past, that the Hindus will prove more generous and will extend to them an equal status in political, economic and social aspects?

Christians and Muslims

There are far more grounds for the Muslims to mistrust Hindus than Christians. Inter-marrying and inter-dining were a possibility between a Muslim and Christian, while both religions recognise no untouchability or caste system. Again in their future outlook on life, in their conception of kingdom of God and brotherhood of man, in their belief in Revealed Religions and in various other ways there are far closer affinities between the two, but it is the plain verdict of History that Christianity in Europe has never tolerated Islam under its government while Muslims in their countries have preserved intact the various Christian nationalities.

The Christian Copts in Egypt, the Armenians in Turkey, the Jews in Palestine have lived under Muslim rule for more than a thousand years without a break, and yet during all this time they were treated as separate nationalities entitled to full rights along with Muslims. Can there be a single example where a Muslim minority has been treated in a European country with equal magnanimity? The fate of Muslims in Albania and South Russia is even now an eye-opener. The Muslims in these countries are being rapidly extirpated and replaced by Italian and Russian settlers.

Hindus in North-West India

Who can say that the Hindus in a future India, where they will have the full rights of a sovereign power at the Centre may not repeat the same tactics and colonise those sparsely populated Muslim parts of India where there is yet abundant scope for surplus population? The peaceful penetration of the Hindu Bania under British protection is even now steadily on the increase in the pure Muslim areas of the North-West. In cities like Bannu, Dera Ghazi Khan and Quetta, where the surrounding districts are purely inhabited by Muslims, Hindus still dominate the urban life in ever-increasing numbers and control all the venues of profit and trade. Unless the Muslims press for

separation immediately from the rest of India, there is danger that the future Federal Government may take up the question of migration in its own hands and finance schemes of colonisation in Sind and the Punjab with a view to settle the starving people of Rajputana or the growing surplus population of the United Provinces in these areas

Mr Gandhi's Second Argument

Mr. Gandhi advances his second argument on the basis of affinity of language, dress, food, etc., between a Muslim and a Hindu. He writes thus, "A Bengali Muslim speaks the same tongue that a Bengali Hindu does, eats the same food, has the same amusements as his Hindu neighbour. They dress alike. I have often found it difficult to distinguish by outward sign between Bengali Hindu and a Bengali Muslim. The same phenomenon is observed more or less in the south among the poor who constitute the masses of India."

Instances from European History

Here again the Mahatma relies upon premises which are illusory. Affinity of language, dress, food, etc., alone does not form a sure basis, for the growth of a single nation. I can prove by various instances from Europe that these conditions exist in a far more effective manner among the people inhabiting the various parts of Europe and yet they are separate nations. "The French and the Italians," in the words of M. Bonnet, "are linked by ties of blood, culture and religion," and yet they are poles asunder politically. The Portuguese and the Spaniards are both descended from the same stock, live in the same country with natural sea-boundaries on three sides and the mountain frontier on one side, speak allied languages of the same origin, and have had a common historical past for over 700 years under Muslim rule. Both these peoples are Roman Catholic by religion, observe common social customs and traditions and have developed common economic interests. In colonising South America, in liberating their country from the Muslim yoke and for carrying on a relentless war against Muslim States, their interest never clashed in the 16th and 17th centuries, and yet they have failed to develop into a united national State.

Common Danger

Like the Indian peoples, they were united against what they

called their common danger in the rising power of Islam, and they fought side by side with this object in view. But as soon as they were freed from Muslim rule, they developed separate national States of their own. If the threat of common danger could not unite two sister communities of the same religion, race and culture, there is no reason how the common fight against British Imperialism could unite the Indian peoples once for all. Independence no doubt was the goal of the Portuguese and Spaniards when they fought against their Muslim masters, but once this goal was achieved, they turned to defend their respective interests and were not reconciled till they were finally separated in national States of their own.

Outward Sign, Not Sure Basis of Nationality

So far as food, dress, amusements, etc., are concerned, there is practically no difference between one European and another or even between a German and an Englishman. You cannot recognise by personal appearance whether a certain European is an Englishman, French, German or Italian, unless you enquire it from him. Even a modern Turk will not be recognised on account of his European dress, unless he declares it so. The real test of nationality is not an outward sign which may or may not exist, but the desire on the part of the members of a nation to group themselves under a separate government of their own, provided they are a compact majority in a compact unit of land. No geographical frontiers or administrative difficulties can stand as permanent obstacles in the way of the natural desire of a people to determine their own government.

The oneness of India to-day is an artificial creation of British rule for its own imperial interests. So even in the past whenever the unity of India was achieved under the rule of a king, it was only meant for imperialistic purposes. The fact that India is a single geographical unit at present, does not mean that it cannot be split up into two or more States. Are not the Iberian Peninsula, Scandinavia, the Balkan Peninsula, and European Russia single geographical units? And yet all of them are the homes of two or more nations.

Real Solution of Minority Problem

The past experience of Europe has clearly proved that unless the minority problem is satisfactorily solved, there can be no real peace in

the world. There are two clear ways in which this problem has been tackled. Firstly, a minority which forms a small fraction of the population in a country and does not occupy a compact part of land, cannot be assigned the status of an independent nation. It can, however, be assured of safeguards for the protection of its religion, language, and culture. Such has been the case of minorities in Rumania, Jugo-Slavia, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, etc. In the same way the Sikhs, Christians, Parsis, Jains, etc., are minorities in the various provinces of India and are not entitled to the status of independent nations. The Muslims too, in seven Provinces are minorities as they do not muster strong in any one of them and do not occupy compact areas.

The second method in which the minority problem was tackled in Europe was the readjustment of existing geographical frontiers to permit minorities occupying compact areas to have the status of independent States. Czarist Russia, the Austro-Hungarian and the Turkish Empires were experimented upon from this standpoint.

Russia and India Compared

In Soviet Russia where the Russians formed more than 75% of the population, the minorities were mostly concentrated, as in case of India on the frontiers of the empire. Hence a chain of independent States came into existence. Finland, Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania and Poland on the western border became independent.

There were no real geographical frontiers which separated these new States from the rest of Russia. In fact, they were closely linked together with Russia by common economic interests. The creation of the new States on the western border of Russia practically blocked it from direct contact with Baltic Sea and other countries beyond. All the important seaports passed into non-Russian hands, yet the Bolsheviks were sincere enough to recognise the right to self-determination of the people of the new States and did not feel any moral justification for interference in their internal affairs.

If the case of India were to be compared with that of Russia after the last war, it would be easily recognised that a united Russia, with the Baltic Provinces as forming an integral part of it, was far more necessary for the economic welfare of Russia than can the North West of India be for India.

North-West India

The bulk of Russian trade passed through the Baltic sea ports, the most advanced districts and industrial and mining centres were situated on the West in Poland and Finland, Russian railways were connected direct with those passing through Baltic States. There were no well-defined frontiers which could separate them from the rest of Russia. Despite, however, all these points in support of union of these States with Russia, separation was accepted as a settled principle.

In India, the question of separation of the North-West does not present similar difficulties so far as the rest of India is concerned. The Hindus stand in no way to suffer or lose materially if Muslims are assigned a separate homeland in the North-West. This region is for administrative purposes already a separate part of India. It has a separate railway system and a drainage system. Its foreign sea-borne commerce mostly passes through Karachi, which is an exclusive seaport for it. It is separated from the rest of India by the deserts of Rajputana and the River Jumna. The Muslims form a compact majority of over 75% in this region. Economically the interests of the people are quite well marked from the rest of India. Unlike the Baltic States in the west of Russia the North-West of India does not command the trade routes of the rest of the country, as the bulk of Indian trade passes through Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. Hence there is no economic loss to the rest of India, if the North-West is separated.

Misreading of Muslim Case

Mr. Gandhi in an emotional view writes in another place, "And is Islam such an exclusive religion as the Quid-i-Azam would have it? Is there nothing in common between Islam and Hinduism or any other religion? Or is Islam merely an enemy of Hinduism? Here again he has deliberately tried to misread the situation. The Christian Armenians and Muslim Kurds have lived together for centuries, speak the same language, eat the same food, wear the same dress, and observe many common social customs and yet they are not prepared to live under the rule of people other than their own or to weld together into a single nation. The Armenians have been given a separate homeland in the new republic of Armenia. This, however, does not mean that Islam is an enemy of Christianity or that there is nothing in common between a Muslim and a Christian."

Issue Before Muslims

The issue before the Muslims is whether in any country or compact part of a country where they are a solid majority, they should have the status of an independent nation or a mere majority depending upon the good will and protection of others. Muslim history has given one and only one reply to this question. The Muslims will never forego their majority rights for any consideration, however weighty it may be.

Example of Albania

Take the case of a small country like Albania in Europe. The Muslims form a majority of 70% in Albania. As long as their interests were secure under the Turkish Empire, they remained content, but once this Empire collapsed and they were left to their fate they decided to form an independent State of their own and chose a Muslim King, though they had far greater chances of security and protection if they had merged into the Serbian or Greek nations with whom they had much in common. They, however, steadily refused these considerations and preferred to lose their independence rather than give up their identity as a separate Muslim people. The Italian rule which has ushered in a reign of tyranny has failed to curb their spirit.

Muslims in Chinese Turkestan

Exactly has been the case of Muslims in Chinese Turkestan. They are a helpless minority of three millions in the Chinese Empire, but, as they are settled in a compact province they have never been content with Chinese rule and have ever been on the outlook for an opportunity to declare their independence. It is only the fear of Russian aggression from the west and the *status quo* policy of British Imperialism in Central Asia which has suppressed so far the Muslim aspirations for independence.

Muslim Claims Irresistible

To think that the Muslims will be content with the status of a minority in the North-West and the North-East of India, where they form a majority of over 75% in population, is simply belying the lessons of Muslim History. If the 15 millions of Afghans, Persians or Turks can make an independent existence, uninterfered with by others, the

Muslims with a population of 30 millions respectively in North-Western India and Bengal have equal rights to claim their independence

The principle of territorial nationality lends an additional support to Muslim claims in these regions. The Muslims fail to understand the advantages which they can have by owing allegiance to a bigger India where a Hindu majority will be permanently placed in power. Can Mr Gandhi suggest what will be the substitute for the loss of independent political power which the Muslims will suffer by placing Muslim Provinces under Hindu domination? How will the Muslims be reconciled by the loss of full control over the vital organs of a national state, i.e. army, navy, air, means of communications, foreign affairs, finance if these are finally transferred to Central Government where the Muslims will always be in a minority? If a similar situation arose in another country, say in the Iberian Peninsula, and the Portuguese were asked to merge their identity into a bigger Spanish nation for the sake of unity, democracy and federation, would the Portuguese ever accept it? I leave the answer to Mr Gandhi.

Muslim Minority Provinces

Muslims can easily follow the advice of Mr Gandhi in provinces where they are a minority. They will willingly agree to remain content as members of a Hindu national State as long as their religious and cultural interests are protected. Muslim minorities have lived in the past in various parts of the world on the best of terms with the members of other religions. But they have never accepted the role of a minority whenever in view of their numbers or physical strength they felt themselves strong enough to form an independent Muslim State. This fact should always be borne in mind when dealing with Muslim problem in India.

Mr Jinnah's Service to Islam

Mr Jinnah has done a real service to Islam by presenting before the Muslims the ideal of a separate independent nation which in due course will lead to the formation of two sovereign States on the eastern and western borders of Hindu India. This movement for independent Muslim States in India will give a tremendous encouragement to similar movements in China and Russia where Muslims have so far been assigned the status of minorities.

In Central Asia, Muslims are a majority of 95% out of a population of 20 millions and yet at present they are kept under subjection by the Chinese and Soviet Governments

Islamic political problems are everywhere of an allied nature. Liberation of one Muslim country will directly affect another. The fate of Muslims in India will have direct repercussions in other parts of the world particularly in the Western Provinces of China and Southern and Eastern parts of Russia, where Muslims are in a majority. Acceptance of minority status within the sub continent of India will besides sealing once for all the fate of 90 million Muslims in India, lead to permanent enslavement of 30 millions of Muslims in Soviet Russia and 50 millions in Western China.

It is quite natural to suppose that if India achieves independence as a united country under the aegis of Congress, it will enter in future into permanent alliance with China and Russia so as to keep the Muslims in the latter three countries under permanent domination. The creation of an independent Muslim State in Central Asia will always be viewed with suspicion by the future Congress Government in India as this will lead to movement for separation among the Muslims in India as well. It is thus a great tribute to the statesmanship of Mr Jinnah that he has foreseen the future so clearly and has set in motion forces which will ultimately promote the cause of Muslim independence in India, China, Central Asia and parts of Southern Russia.

PAKISTAN SCHEME AND THE SIKHS

North-West India Distinct from Hindustan By M. R. T.
in 'The Eastern Times' April, 26 1940.

The Pakistan Scheme has raised a storm of opposition from certain quarters which do not see eye to eye with Muslims. The Sikhs in particular have expressed their strong opposition through a number of meetings.

Master Tara Singh, the leader of the extremist section among the Sikhs, has declared that the Pakistan scheme has dealt a blow to the cause of Swaraj and that the Sikhs will repudiate it.

Sir Jogendra Singh, a moderate Sikh leader, admits that "obstacles in the way of union are many. There is a pervading air of distrust which is growing as the days pass." He agrees with the Muslims that "theories of pure democracy are inapplicable to India or as a matter of fact to any country." He suggests that "the remedy is not separation, but balanced representation of all interests. It is in securing balanced representation of the classes as the masses that Mr. Jinnah will find the best means of securing the position of his co-religionists."

India in the Past

The basic idea of opposition to the Pakistan Scheme is supplied by the notion, held so far, that India with its present bounds and limits is a permanent geographical unit and not a mere collection of countries, as is believed by Muslims. One may justly invite the attention of the reader to the condition of India immediately prior to the British rule. The Punjab, with some parts of the Frontier Province and Kashmir, was an independent kingdom under the Sikhs. Sind and Baluchistan were governed by their own chiefs, while the rest of India was split up into a number of independent States of which the most important were the Mahratta confederacy, Mysore, Hyderabad, Oudh and Bengal. Whatever unity India achieved in the past under Muslim rule was the result of external circumstances which brought the greater part of India under a central administration. Even prior to the Muslim invasion of India, the country had lacked unity.

When Mahmud of Ghazni invaded India in the tenth century, he met with no united opposition from a Central Hindu Empire. The Indian continent was then divided into a number of independent kingdoms often at war with one another, and mostly governed by Rajput chiefs. This period in Indian History which roughly extends over a 1,000 years, is called the Rajput Period. Strictly speaking, during the long Hindu Period which extended over 2,000 years or more, India never existed as a single political unit with the present-day bounds and limits. As is truly described by the author of Robert's Historical Geography, "no lasting imperial dominion in India was ever established by a Hindu people, though on three occasions such an event appeared to come within the bounds of possibility." The short lived empire of Asoka which was strictly speaking a Buddhist enterprise, did not include many parts of present-day India while Samundra Gupta's empire about 400 A.D. and Harsha's empire 200 years later did not extend beyond the river Jumna and the Vindhyachal Mountains, nor did they found any lasting dynasty.

India Under Muslims

The past clearly indicates that it was the Muslims who first gave the idea of unity to the people in the vast sub-continent of India, and this not with a view to see the Muslim population absorbed among the Hindus, but simply because it suited the expansion policy of the Muslim kings. Hindus and Muslims never joined together as members of one coherent nation, but only as members of two different religions and cultures who were placed by destiny under a common system of government. The Muslim kings undoubtedly pursued a liberal policy of toleration towards their Hindu subjects, recognised their freedom of religion and worship and extended their favours alike to Hindus and Muslims. Under Akbar the Great, an attempt was made for the first time to unite Hindus and Muslims by an appeal to a new common religion, but the attempt met with opposition from all quarters and proved a failure. Thereafter the Hindus and Muslims never had any opportunity to work together under a common system of government which they could claim as the result of their own efforts. On the other hand, the rise of the Sikhs, Rajputs and Mahrattas on the collapse of the Mughal Empire and their frequent inroads into Muslim States of Hyderabad, Oudh and Bengal, widened the gulf that already separated the Hindu from the Muslim and gave clear proofs that the new Hindu movements were inspired by a feeling of hatred towards Muslim religion.

and people and aimed at their complete domination and suppression. History still reminds us of the oppressive and tyrannical rule to which the Muslims were subjected under the Sikhs in the Punjab and the Mahrattas in Central and Southern India.

India Prior to British Rule

If the British had not come into the field, there would have been a decisive trial of strength between the Muslims and Hindus, and the one-nation theory of Mr Gandhi would have been shattered once for all. The combined might of Mysore, Hyderabad, Bengal and Oudh, backed up by the active support to Muslim countries beyond India, was still quite strong enough to cope with the new dangers that threatened Muslim solidarity in India.

Even in their decadent condition, the Muslims yet ruled over more than 2/3rd population of India. The modern provinces of the U P, Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, Sind, the greater part of Madras Presidency which was then ruled by the Nawab of Carnatic or Hyder Ali of Mysore and Mysore itself were all wrested by the British from the Muslims. The Mahrattas and Sikhs together governed less than 1/3rd of India and their sway extended over the Punjab, Bombay Presidency and the Central Provinces.

The Sikh kingdom in the Punjab was bound to collapse in the long run, as the Sikhs were torn away by mutual jealousies and quarrels of the various tribes and were exposed to attacks on their western bounds by strong and hardy Muslim warriors. The Sikhs were a mere minority in their own kingdom and had secured domination over a people who were physically and intellectually of the same brand as themselves. The Muslim Jats and Rajputs of the Punjab outnumbered the Sikhs by 5 to 1 and would have risen in arms if the Sikh kingdom had been invaded by Muslim armies and there had arisen internal differences among the Sikh chiefs.

This, however, could not be said in regard to Muslim rule in Bengal, Mysore, Sind, and the U P. The Muslims were a majority of population in Bengal, and found to their advantage a subject people who were poor in physical strength and intellect. In Mysore, Hyder Ali had established a strong kingdom. The subject people were mostly Hindus, but they had been so demoralised by centuries of peaceful rule in the past that they had lost touch with the art of fighting.

The Mahrattas

The Mahratta danger had lost its moral force. The crushing defeat in the third battle of Panipat in 1716 had dealt a death blow to the power of the Peshwas and hence-forth, Holkars, Scindia and Bhonsla had become the rivals for the distribution of the Mahratta Empire. The mutual jealousies and quarrels of the Mahratta chiefs would have once again turned to the advantage of the Muslims, and another appeal to the Muslim kingdoms to unite against a common danger would have once again proved a decisive factor in the history of India. Whatever might have been the outcome of the struggle, in the long run it was certain that the Muslim majorities in Bengal and North-West of India would have been politically awakened to their own sense of importance. Muslims might have lost their States in those parts of India where they were a minority, but they would have gained a permanent foothold in Bengal and North-West where they were a majority of population.

Lesson from the Past

It is, however, of no use to unravel the past except to learn the lesson that India was never united into one nation, and that prior to the British rule, the political leaders of the Muslims and Hindus struggled for the mastery of power. If the two communities had agreed to mark their spheres of influence and confined their activities to the consolidation of their respective position in those areas where they were in a majority and were entitled to govern, a common line of action might have been pursued against the new British danger. But India was then a mere geographical expression and no statesman could visualise a future where both communities could live as a united nation.

A similar position confronts India to day. The British Empire is passing through a political crisis. It is ready to release its hold on India, provided the people come to terms with it on an agreed formula. Hindus or Muslims separately cannot bend the British Government to yield to any of their demands. Unless they unite, the cause for independence is likely to be indefinitely postponed. The political leaders of both the communities have failed to inspire confidence among others. The Muslims are not prepared to live as a minority community in those provinces where they are in a majority and demand the status of an independent nation. Hindus on the other hand, wish to keep India united, as in this way alone they can dominate the Centre and control the Muslim Provinces.

Muslim Problem in India

The problem, so far as Hindus and Muslims are concerned is very simple and admits of no insuperable difficulties. The Muslims form one-fourth of the total population of India and number 90 millions. It is nothing less than political jugglery to treat such a big community as a minority for the sake of a united India which never existed in the past and which does not appeal to the Muslim political mind. There is no precedence among independent countries of to-day where such a big minority exists.

In Europe there is hardly any country with a minority exceeding one or two millions in numbers. The German Empire of to-day has under it many Non-German peoples, Poles, Czechs, Danes, etc., but this is not considered a permanent solution of the problem. The present war in fact has been fought to liberate these minorities from German rule.

Minority Problem in Europe

European statesmen after the last Great War made a serious effort to settle the minority problem. The word "minority" was given a definite interpretation. It was subjected to two clear definitions. If a minority is scattered in a country, and does not form a compact majority by itself in any well-defined geographical part, it cannot be assured of safeguards for the protection of its religion, language and culture.

The Magyars in Rumania, the Croats in Jugo-Slavia, the Poles in pre-war Germany, the Muslim Tatars in European Russia number more than a million each, and occupy many compact areas in these countries. Muslims in European Russia are a majority in Crimea, Kalmuk, Bashkir, Daghestan, Karzan and number over 5 millions and yet they are treated as a minority community. The Magyars occupy compact areas inside the Transylvanian Province of Rumania, and yet they are deprived of the status of an independent nation.

On the same lines the Sikhs are a minority in the Punjab, numbering 3 millions, and can only be assured of safeguards of religion, language and culture like the minorities in European countries. If they are conceded the status of independent nation, the Muslims in Hindu

Provinces, like the U P where they are double the number of Sikhs, in Bihar, and Assam where they exceed Sikhs and in Madras and Bombay where they are slightly lower in population than the Sikhs in the Punjab, will also have to be conceded the status of independent nations

Minorities in Europe Prior to 1919

A minority, however, can claim the status of an independent nation only when it is settled in a well-defined and compact geographical region. European statesmen in 1919 were clearly alive to this fact when they broke up the Austro-Hungarian Empire into a number of separate States and recognised the independence of five States on the western border of Russia.

The Finns, the Estonians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians and the Poles lived before the last war as minorities in European Russia. Their countries formed part of Russia and were linked together with it by means of communications and other economical factors. The entire Russian foreign trade of the Baltic Sea passed through the seaports on the western coast. Yet it was deemed necessary to establish five independent States in the west of Russia. By a simple readjustment of Russian administrative Provinces, new States were created and the minorities were converted into majorities.

There was, however, one essential condition which entitled these minority peoples to claim independence. This was the fact that they were not scattered in small numbers over a big area, but were concentrated in compact areas of well-defined limits where they formed a majority of population. Here in India, if the principle of self-determination is applied, the present 11 Provinces will clearly be recognised as well-defined geographical units, entitled to claim full independence if the people so demand.

Muslim and Sikh Cases Compared

It is simply confusing the issues when the Sikhs put up their case in the category of the Muslim community of India. If the Muslims within Hindu India where they number over 20 millions can be content to be under a Hindu majority rule at the Centre, there is no reason why the Sikhs with a numerical strength of 3 millions should not be content with their status in the Muslim Federation of the North-West.

For the sake of 3 millions of Sikhs who can on no modern test claim the status of an independent nation 90 millions of Muslims cannot sacrifice the rights for independence of 60 millions of them who are concentrated in well-defined geographical and administrative units in two separate parts of India

The problem before the Muslims in India to-day is to reduce their strength as a minority to reasonable limits. They do not claim independence for 90 millions of these people but only for 2/3rds of them. If the Sikh method of division were accepted, then Muslims would lay claim to many other parts of India where they excel the Sikhs in numbers

Muslims in U P

The Province of the U P alone is of far more importance to Muslims there than the Punjab can be to the Sikhs. The Muslims number 7 millions and form 1/7th of the population. The Sikhs in the Punjab number 3 millions and form 1/10th of the population. The Aligarh Muslim University Deoband Azamgarh and many other places are the centres of Muslim religion and culture while Roorki, Banda and other places are sacred to Muslim memory. The whole of the U P has been a centre of Muslim culture and civilisation in the past, its historical mosques places, mausoleums and gardens still remind one of the grandeur of Muslim architecture in the past. Historically, politically and spiritually and numerically the Muslims have a far greater interest in the future of the U P than the Sikhs in the Punjab, and yet they are helpless in face of the principle of self-determination which cannot change the minority status of the Muslims there.

If the Sikhs will insist on a separate homeland for them they can have no more than 2 or 3 districts of the Punjab on the basis of their population though they will be a minority of population in each of them separately. But this claim on their part will lead to further counter claims on the part of Muslims in the U P and other parts of India where they are six times as many as the Sikhs in the Punjab. If the Sikhs are really determined not to live under the rule of Muslim majority, the Muslims are equally determined not to live under the rule of Hindu majority. Whatever privileges will be claimed by the Sikhs in the Punjab, similar ones will be demanded by Muslims elsewhere.

Lesson from Other Countries

The Sikhs should learn the lesson from other countries. A minority so small in numbers, and scattered over different parts of one country, cannot attain the status of an independent nation. As I have stated above, the Magyars in Rumania, the Muslim Tatars in European Russia, the Jews in pre-war Poland, the Croats in Jugo-Slavia can by no stretch of imagination be allowed to have independent States. The Jews numbered 3 millions in Poland before Germany invaded the country, but it was never conceded that they could ever claim an independent status. Similarly the Muslim Tatars in European Russia, who number 5 millions, cannot claim the status of an independent nation. The Sikhs are a minority in the strict sense of the word and their future is irrevocably connected with Muslim North-West, where they will be assigned the status of an important minority with special rights and privileges over and above their numerical strength. The Muslims are serving the cause of the real Punjab when they claim separation, for as in this way alone the Punjabis can dominate the proposed North-West Federation.

The Punjab can play no important part in a United India where its interests will be inadequately defended at the Centre and where it will lose its present position as an independent economic unit. The creation of a bigger Punjab with natural expansion in the North-West and South, so as to include Kashmir, the Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan, is in reality the regeneration of the old historical kingdom which the Sikhs tried to keep united in their time of glory and which now will be supported by the combined might of Muslims and Sikhs. A true Punjabi should always try to place the interests of his country first and should never agree to see his country fall from its real position. The Punjab as a dominant partner in a Federation of the North-West will be the master of its own house and will exert her full force at the Centre.

It will have a commanding voice in determining the problems that will affect its own future and will control the army, the navy, air and other defence services in proportion to its population. Can it be expected in case of a united India, that Punjab will play the dominant part? Already the present monopoly of the Punjab in the army has been challenged and the time is not far when the Sikhs and Muslim elements in the army will be reduced to insignificance. Similarly the

economic interests of the Punjab are bound to come into conflict with Hindu India. The Punjab's future lies in the pursuit of a policy of free trade so as to find markets for its raw materials in Europe and other parts of the world, while in return it will buy manufactured goods at low competitive prices. The country will be a loser all round and will be at the mercy of the capitalists of Hindu India if it accepts a system of government at the Centre where its voice will be comparatively ineffective.

Politically, geographically and economically, the Punjab has more in common with Kashmir, the Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Sind than with the rest of India. The entire North-West is a distinct natural region fertilised by the Indus and its five distributaries. It has separate drainage and railway system. It has a separate outlet in Karachi through which the bulk of its foreign trade passes. It is separated from the rest of India by the river Jumna and the deserts of Rajputana. If a barrier were raised on the eastern boundary of the Punjab and all communications were stopped with the rest of India, there would be no great effect on the economic life of the people. Whatever Punjab wants to obtain from the West it can have through Karachi. Its exports have a natural outlet in the south-west. It is in fact a complete well-defined geographical unit raising no administrative difficulties on its separation from the rest of India.

Congress does not face Realities

Rejoinder to Mr Kripalani, by M R T. in
'The Eastern Times' June 20 1940.

Mr J B Kripalani, in an article in the "Tribune" of June 17 under the heading "Confusing Issues" vainly attempts to prove by a long chain of arguments that coalition cabinets and national cabinets are no remedy for the present political deadlock in India. He derides the offer from a section of the Muslim League to drop for the time being the scheme of separation only if coalition cabinets are formed at the Centre and in the Provinces. He admits that the Government, the Anglo-Indian Press, the Liberals and even some Congressmen entertain and encourage this idea and yet he seeks to justify the Congress position in refusing to come to terms with the Muslim League.

Analogy Inapplicable

He confuses the issues entirely by quoting the analogy of England. It is evident to a student of politics that the system of government in vogue in England can suit a homogeneous country. The party system of government in the British Parliament is subject to constant changes on the part of the electorate. The Conservatives, the Liberals and the Labourites can seize power in turn or unite in case of a national emergency. There are no fundamental differences which can bring them into conflict for all times. The English people are one by religion, race and language. They have common historical traditions and political aspirations. There are no deep-rooted misgivings among them on the basis of history or a divergent outlook on life.

Conditions in India

Here in India the conditions are entirely different. Hindus and Muslims are not merely two religious communities, they are two distinct nations representing separate social orders and civilisations. Their interests clash in almost all material aspects, i.e. politically, economically, culturally and spiritually.

A Hindu looks to his ancient past for political inspiration, he takes pride in the revival of the ancient Hindu culture, philosophy

and art His economic interests are absolutely exclusive As a community of money-lenders, bankers and traders, the Hindus are looked upon with suspicion by the Muslims everywhere The rigidity of caste system, which is still observed in its old form by the vast majority of Hindus, applies with force against untouchables with force against peoples Inter-dining and inter-marrying among Hindus and Muslims are unheard of in India The Hindu reverences the cow and will deny the Muslim the right to kill this animal for food purposes

There are a thousand other ways in which the two communities stand diametrically opposed in the observance of their religious rites, customs and other social practices A day of public rejoicing for a Hindu may be a day of mourning for a Muslim This happens when Dussera coincides with Mohurram There are no two nations on earth which present far greater differences than the Hindus and Muslims of India

French and Italians

The French and the Italians are two distinct nations in Europe, but it will be found on careful observation that there are far less differences between them than between Hindus and Muslims Both of these European peoples are Christian by religion and are members of the same sect, i.e. Roman Catholics They acknowledge the Pope of Rome as the spiritual head of the Roman Catholic Church They belong to a common stock and claim their descent from the Latin race They speak allied languages of common origin Intermarrying and interdining between a French and Italian family are not banned Thousands of Italians have adopted French nationality without incurring the displeasure of other Italians, and so is the case with the French workers who permanently settle in Italy and adopt it as their motherland In social customs, in dress, in games and sports, in amusements and excursions, in education and literary activities, the tastes of the two peoples are more or less the same. You cannot distinguish an Italian from a French by his dress or habits It is in recognition of these common points of similarity that M Bannet, a French statesman, once said, "The Italians and the French are linked together by ties of blood, religion and race." In spite, however, of all that can be said in support of the possibility of a real union between the two nations, one difference alone, i.e., separate political aspirations, has divided the two peoples and estranged their sympathies permanently.

Common Motherland

The supporters of one-nation theory may perhaps discredit the above line of argument and suggest that the Italians and French lack the link of a common motherland. But here too it will be proved from examples that they do not stand on a sure ground. The Poles and Russians have lived together in the western provinces of Russia, they are united by ties of a common religion and common race. Alternatively in the past, these nations have dominated a great part of western Russia. They are, however, still poles asunder politically.

The Norwegians and Swedes in Scandinavia, the Portuguese and Spaniards in the Iberian Peninsula, the Magyars and Slovenes in Hungary and the English and the Irish in Ireland repeat the same story. The link of a common motherland has failed to unite these peoples in the past. The only obstacle which has stood in the way of a common nationality on the part of these peoples has been their conception of a distinct political status.

Muslim Case in India

The Muslim in India furnish simply another example of what has been proved in Europe. They cannot merge their identity in Hinduism or their pseudo-nationalism. They have a distinct political future on the basis of their historical importance and numerical strength. They are concentrated to the number of 60 millions in two separate parts in the north-west and north-east of India. No modern test can deny them the status of a separate nation.

The Indian Muslims fulfil the two essential conditions which the European statesmen applied with success in determining the fate of the minorities in the former Austro-Hungarian and the Turkish Empires. They are a compact majority in well-defined compact areas. Unlike the Sikhs they are not a small minority of 12% and scattered in more or less proportion all over the Punjab. They form a population of 28 millions out of a total population of 34 millions living in Sind, the Frontier Province, Kashmir, Baluchistan and the Punjab, short of Ambala Division and some Hindu and Sikh States. Similarly in Eastern Bengal and Assam they number 30 millions out of the total population of 40 millions.

Non-Muslim Minorities

There is no other community in India except the Hindus and Muslims who can be entitled to the status of a separate nation on the basis of the theory outlined i.e., a compact majority in a compact area of well-defined limits. The Sikhs, the Indian Christians, the Jains and the Parsis are mere minorities in the modern sense of the word. They can be assured of safeguards for the protection of their religion, culture and language, but they cannot have a supreme and final voice in the national organs of a modern state, i.e. Army, Navy, Defence, Foreign Affairs, etc.

If the Muslims had been a scattered minority in India and had not mustered together in sufficient strength in any part of India, they would have been content with the status of a minority. Even now the Muslims do not demand sovereign rights for 30 millions of their brothers who live in Hindu-majority Provinces. The Muslims in the U P alone form 14% of the population and are double the number of the Sikhs in the Punjab and yet they do not claim a dominant voice in the administration as the Sikhs claim under their fantastic Khalistan scheme.

Russian Claim

Mr J B Kripalani is trying to apply western theories in so far as they suit the Hindu community. His case is just like a Russian who will always base his claims high on the ground of a common economic programme to enslave the peoples in Baltic Provinces, Trans-Caucasia and Central Asia. The Russians in Europe consider their country as one compact land which admits of no vivisection. In fact the Baltic Provinces and Poland in the West and the Trans-Caucasian States of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia are contiguous with Russia proper and form geographically a real part of it. But the peoples living in these parts have never admitted the claims of Russians for domination and asserted the independence when the old Czarist Russia collapsed. Even now the Latvians, Estonians and Lithuanians are struggling for their independence. If Russia succeeds through sheer aggression to put an end to the independence of these States, this act will never be justified on moral grounds. The Hindus in India should take a lesson from the European situation. There can be no peace in the world unless the status of peoples, who on any modern test are capable

of forming independent sovereign states, is determined. The Muslims are a minority in India by accident. It is the force of the British bayonet which has preserved the unity of this vast sub-continent. If this force is removed, the country will split up into its natural parts.

Muslim Attitude at Present

Muslims however, realise the gravity of the situation at present. They are alive to the Nazi menace in Europe which, in league with Fascism, is bent upon the domination of the world. They are determined to resist this new danger and to sink all their differences to unite for common cause. Indian Muslims are willing to postpone consideration of the Pakistan scheme till the termination of the war, but they will never accept a position which will reduce them to insignificance.

The Congress game is to wrest all power in the Central and Provinces in the name of the Indian nation which does not exist. It has threatened to withdraw all support from the Government unless its demands are met in full.

The Muslim League, on the other hand, is ready to co-operate with the Congress on an equal basis. It is ready to extend full support to the Government and it will take the League representatives into full confidence.

It is now the Congress alone which is pursuing a policy of obstruction. Threats of Civil Disobedience or withdrawal of active support from the war cannot force the Muslims to forego their principles. Congress is precipitating matters and hastening civil war by openly condemning the Muslim League and its leaders. Muslim India will never forgive the present Hindu leaders once the opportunity comes to decide their future destiny.

Two Indias

What an Englishman Thinks of Pakistan Scheme.

By Patrick Lacey in the 'Contemporary Review' and in
'The Eastern Times', August 2, 1940

The Lahore session of the All-India Muslim League had two immediate effects. It stimulated resistance by Indian minorities, especially Mohamedans, to the communal authoritarianism (as they call it) of Congress hegemony, and it revived interest in Pakistan scheme for the division of India into two independent Dominions. Here in England we have much criticism of the Pakistan Idea, but no adequate explanation of it. It is mentioned so vaguely as an 'Indian Ulster' that very few people can give it with understanding the treatment it merits—to be damned as a nightmare, tolerated as an academic dream, or entertained as a *pis aller* to mitigate communal difficulties when other expedients have failed. If we are doomed to argue about it, for or against, we had better try to see exactly what it is.

The Indian Statutory (Simon) Commission and the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Indian Reform put the premises concisely in their study of the communal problem. 'Differences of race, a different system of law, and the absence of inter-marriage, constitute a basic opposition manifesting itself at every turn in social custom and economic competition.' 'They (the Hindus and Muslims) may be said to represent two distinct and separate civilisations.' Mr Jinnah said much the same in his presidential speech to the Muslim League on Good Friday. His inference seems to be that some partition of India may become the only means of satisfying the legitimate hopes of Hindu and Muslim alike, and of giving each community a form of self-government appropriate to its distinctive traits. In this, he is supported by others, not Muslims only, who reject the obstructionist doctrine that India cannot or must not be emancipated completely except as a single geographical polity, one huge compound of federated units. If, they say, we cannot agree ourselves on terms for our advance hand-in-hand to freedom under a single responsible government, let the Hindu nation and the Muslim nation go ahead as well as they can separately; don't hold us back together just because we quarrel.

The Scheme

Hence the Pakistan scheme—the oldest and least fissiparous of several efforts by different authors to redraw the map. Taking numbers-cum-vigour as the yardstick, it assumes with obvious reasons that Indian Mohammedanism is most conspicuously concentrated, most virile and self-contained, in the block of contiguous territories comprising the Punjab, Kashmir, the North-west Frontier Province and Agencies, Sind, Baluchistan, Khairpur and Bahawalpur. These seven components would make up Pakistan, with a Federal or Dominion capital at Lahore and a growing air and sea-port at Karachi. It would have an area roughly seventy-five times the size of Ulster, and equal to Spain, Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Albania, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Lithuania and Eire combined. It would contain as many people as Albania, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Lithuania and Switzerland together. (None of these countries is usually considered except by Germany, too small to deserve an independent sovereignty.) But that disposes only of a quarter of India and less than a tenth of her population. The rest of her, constituting a Dominion of Hindustan, would still have nearly three times as many people as any other nation in the world except China, and would be seventh largest in area. Calcutta, Lucknow or Madras might be its capital.

These calculations take account of an ancillary proposal. Each of the Dominions might have a Governor-General. For the discharge of its Commonwealth responsibilities—always limited, and often an expression of sentiment only—the Crown would still be represented at Delhi. The Delhi enclave to-day is very small, and at least one of the plans published in India suggests it might incorporate parts of the Ambala and Jullundur Divisions of the Punjab. In both of these adjoining Divisions—contiguous partly with the United Provinces—Hindus and Sikhs together are a robust and substantial majority. They might be restive in a Pakistan under Muslim control, and the Pakistan Government uncomfortable with them, and their separation would avoid the difficulty of letting Patiala and other Sikh statelets stand as islands in Pakistan territory. The Delhi enclave, thus enlarged, would have an area and population just about twice the size of Switzerland's and might be a useful buffer between the two great Dominions on their strategic border. In its strictly domestic affairs, it could be a condominium administered by the Viceroy, its own representatives, and nominees of the Hindustan and Pakistan Central Governments.

In this same authority, too, would vest control of India's continental defence—her Navy, Air Force and the greater part of her Army—and perhaps the Customs Revenue required to pay for them. Pakistan and Hindustan each would want a small army for internal security, but the pooling of first-line-troops under Delh's neutral though representative command would guarantee each against assault by the other. There are very obvious flaws in the idea. Its supporters think, rightly or wrongly, that they have answers at least to some of them.

Objections Answered

(1) A third of all the Indian Muslims live in Bengal, several hundred miles from the nearest point of Pakistan, and are the Presidency's majority community. If they are to be forgotten, or reckoned as Hindustanis, what becomes of the plan's main purpose? It is argued nonetheless that the comments already quoted from two reports of Parliament are true more especially of the difference between Pakistan and Hindustan—that the test of numbers-cum-vigour holds good. It is the distinguished characteristics of Pakistan and Hindustan that would be most likely to aggravate serious conflict in a single Federal Parliament with a large majority from the one dominating a minority from the other, were obtrusive over the whole of India. The Bengal Mohammedan has more in common with his Hindu neighbours than the Punjabi Hindu with a Madras Hindu. For these reasons, and also because Europeans hold the balance of power in the Bengal legislature, the Presidency should be able (it is said) to muddle along as an integral part of Hindustan. If not, it is invited either to detach itself with a constitution similar to Burma's or to let its districts east of the Brahmaputra become a self-governing colony of the Pakistan or the Delhi condominium. Rather a cavalier dismissal!

(2) Kashmir—in area a big part of Pakistan, though its population is small—is a Hindu State inasmuch as its ruling dynasty is Hindu. But nearly 90 per cent of its oppressed people are Muslims and democracy of some sort is a motive of the whole scheme. Hyderabad, where a Muslim dynasty rules a big Hindu majority, is expected to federate with Hindustan, so why not Kashmir with Pakistan? This argument may be less repugnant to a timid Political Department than the suggestion that the Maharaja of Kashmir should exchange thrones with the Muslim ruler of a Hindu majority in Bhopal.

(3) The scheme cannot kill the communal problem there would be minorities scattered about in both Dominions. In round figures Pakistan would have 25 million Muslims to 6 million Hindus and or Sikhs. Hindustan would have 225 million Hindus to 55½ millions Muslims if it includes Bengal or otherwise 223 to 27½. Yet the suggested partition is defended as the least impracticable means of signifying India's great religious division in politico-geographical terms as the only means of giving each community a government system it can approve of. Thus gratified (it is argued) they should have less quarrel with their minorities, and the minority in one Dominion would be a hostage for the good behaviour of its co-religionists in the other. Hideous thought, but the existing Constitution, or any other seriously contemplated, must create a similar condition in autonomous provinces. Mohammedans all over India observed a special day of thanksgiving for escape from Congress rule when the Congress Ministries had retroceded their duties to British officials. They say that under an All-India Federal Government and Parliament, the Mohammedans both inside and outside their special provinces would be hostages to Hindu fortune. They resist their subjection to a Hindu majority just as the Jews in Palestine dislike the idea of majority rule of the Arabs—and India, about 180 times larger, lends its better to partition plans. Hence the Pakistan idea is favoured by Jinnah and other Muslims in Hindu provinces where it cannot directly benefit them.

(4) Could Pakistan be financially solvent? Orthodox economists say 'unless the Punjab continued to provide the backbone of the Indian Army'. There is some reason to suppose that it would. The Punjab, containing nearly two thirds of Pakistan's population, was found to be the only province needing no redistribution of funds from the Central Government when Sir Otto Niemeyer recommended his adjustments between Central and Provincial Finance. Other nations have carried on, somehow, long after orthodoxy has condemned them to ruin. Hopes are also fixed on the development of Kashmir (whose Maharaja cannot really need twelve times the Viceroy's salary), the prosperity of the newly-irrigated Sind, and something like durable peace on the frontier.

Only Way to End Frontier Trouble

Of all these speculative answers to much less hypothetical objections, the last challenges the most interesting discussion for it is based on belief in the Pakistan plan as a remedy for the tribal sore on the

North-West border. In the words of officialdom, "the time has arrived when an effort should be made to be made to bring under our control, and, if possible, to organise for purposes of defence, the great belt of tribal territory which is along our North-Western frontier." A well-groomed phase; but it was written fifty-three years ago by the Government of India to the Government of Punjab. Nothing came to it then, we can see how much has come to it since. Parliament were told last July that seven years' disturbances in Pakistan had cost the Army and Air Force 113 men killed and 377 wounded. People were worried about those casualties, and dismayed that we needed a garrison of 20,000 troops in Palestine. Very few noticed that in two years' unfinished campaign against the Wazirs we had employed some 40,000 troops, losing 306 killed and 888 wounded. And now, when every available man, weapon and penny is to be called into the war against Germany—when economy in all directions is preached everywhere—we learn that three years of scrapping and skirmishing have not been enough to settle Waziristan, but a new expedition has had to go prowling about the Ahmedzai salient.

It is a tiny whisper as modern war goes, of course. The sixteen frontier expeditions or military demonstrations of the last ten years cannot have cost, in aggregate, the price we pay for the thirty-six hours' war in Europe, nor the loss of life we suffered in H M S s "Courageous" and "Royal Oak". But the cost in money is a big sum for India, and Britain is still constitutionally responsible for military activity in India.

Abdul Ghaffar Khan, leader of the Frontier Red Shirts, once told me his alliance with the Congress was an expedient to be abandoned so soon as it seemed to interfere with Pathan notions of independence, "for what have we to do with Hindustan". If that was the mind of a Pathan in British India proper—if the Simon Commission, the Joint Parliamentary Committee and Mr Jinnah were right—we can hardly expect the militant zealots of Islam in tribal territory to accept laws made by the votes of a Hindu majority in Delhi. The argument runs that the tribes cannot be wholly subdued except by costly and amoral violence, nor inveighed into an Indian comity, for their own and the general good, if this requires their submission to an alien authority. Rule by a Hindu majority from Madras, Bombay, Bihar, the U P. and so on would seem at least so alien to them as the present British mixture of bribery, camaraderie and battery. But offer them a square deal and

tolerable amenities in their own territory, let them see a Mohammedan Government established at Lahore on principles they can appreciate, let that Government persuade them with such coercion as they make necessary, to co-operate with it in digesting the responsibility and fruits of civilised administration. It is possible that they then at last reconcile themselves to a new and better order of life within an Indian commonwealth. Some people think this could be done without the creation of an independent Pakistan, others are convinced that the bogey of an over-riding, alien Delhi-made regime would either deter the tribes and the outset, or provoke their secession eventually, from a system of provincial autonomy embracing all India.

Pakistan may be a Utopian dream or something worse. The arguments against it need no advertisement. But at the same moment it seems to be gaining favour for reasons, and in a particular manner, that bode nobody any good whether there is anything to be said for the idea or not. It would be a mistake to assume that all Hindus to a man are opposed to it and will always be ready to resist it. If we believe it to be something worse than a dream, we had better make a reconnaissance flight over its last line of defence, so that we may know exactly what, where and how we must attack it if we want to win our offensive with the minimum cost to either side—or all three sides. This, perhaps, is the last ditch argument.

The unity of India is the artificial creation of a unitary Government imposed from without whether the binding force is popular approval, submission or antagonism. It is a Good Thing, but not indigenous to the country or natural to its people and history. The British were able to take India because they found it divided against itself. They took a large part of it from the Mussalman Moghuls. They fought a variety of Hindu chieftains. They conquered at times with Muslim allies at others with Hindu allies. The country has never known unity from Gilgit to Trivandrum and from Quetta to Calcutta save in the peace imposed on it by British rule. Many breaches and divisions have been healed, probably for ever, but the fundamental differences between Hindu and Mohammedan remain and look as if they must remain, and it is no more Britain's business to subordinate the one civilisation to the other than to aid the subjection of Bohemia to German Kultur. The alien bond of unity is now about to go and lest its disappearance should release fullblast the disintegrating tenden-

cies now reappearing, there is something to be said for redistributing India as fairly, naturally and securely as possible to the rival claimants from whom Britain seized it—and who helped the British in each other's dispossession. In a talk reported to the 'Manchester Guardian' nine years ago Mr Gandhi spoke with regret, but without noticable emotion, of the possibility that independence might plunge his country into civil strife, and that this might end in the destruction of one community by the other. If that is a possibility, and if the only alternative to it is a choice between two lesser evils, let us decide now what our choice shall be. Let us say we would rather have two free Indian Dominions, each as nearly homegeneous as it can be than one enormous cockpit of feuds under the ignominy of alien rule.

Demand for Partition

Speech at Salem by Periyar E V. Ramaswami, Leader of the Justice Party. "The Sunday Observer", April 28, 1940

A monster meeting of the citizens of Salem was held on the 19th inst to celebrate the Partition Day, at the Victoria Market Maidan, Salem. Such a large concourse of people, numbering 30,000, it was said, had never before met at any public meeting in the history of Salem. Janab Ataullah Sahib presided over the meeting

Mr. K M. Balasubramaniam, Advocate, Madras, spoke for about 20 minutes. In the course of his speech, he laid stress on the need for separation of India on a racial basis and referred to the motives of those who opposed the demand of Periyar E V Ramaswami and Mr Jinnah.

When Mr Balasubramaniam was speaking, a number of rowdies and hooligans, evidently engaged by Congressmen and Hindu Mahasabhis, threw stones and sand and caused injury to some persons and inconvenience to others. The Police attempted to check hooligans and had to resort to lathi charge, in which some of the hooligans were stated to have been injured.

After a few minutes, calm was restored and the vast gathering listened attentively to the speech of Periyar.

Periyar E V Ramaswami who was given a tremendous ovation, when he rose to speak, spoke for over 1½ hours in Tamil. The following is the substance of his speech:—

They had assembled there in such large numbers to celebrate the Partition Demand Day, and it was most atrocious that their political opponents should try to create disturbance at that meeting. It seemed as though Congressmen had no other programme or policy.

What is Wrong?

Was there anything wrong in their demand for partition? When there were serious differences of opinion, was it not more harmful

to remain united? There was nothing sinful or treacherous in asking for partition, nor could it be said that the person asking for partition because of serious differences of opinion, was working against the best interests of the family. As regards the political partition they were asking, it was neither new or strange nor a difficult or impossible proposition.

India was never a united country or nation. It was made into something like a united country by foreigners for the purpose of convenient exploitation and the Aryans of this land became their allies. All Indians did not belong to one family, they were not the sons of a common mother or a common father. They belonged to different families and continued to live as different families. Just as the Jail Superintendent or Jailer could not be the head of the family of the prisoners, just as the convict, warders could not be considered as the protecting guardians of the prisoners, so also neither the British nor the Aryans in this country could be considered the heads of our families or the guardians of our rights and interests.

India was Never a Nation

They were seeing before their eyes everyday the spectacle of the elder brother riding roughshod over the demand of other brothers for partition and thereby being the cause of all family troubles and difficulties. Similarly there would be great trouble and unrest if partition on a racial basis was not made. The Indian family consisted, as a matter of fact, not of uterine brothers but of members belonging to different families, religions, countries and so on, and all these heterogeneous elements were, strangely enough characterised as one family which it was said, should not be divided or partitioned, because the "unity" would be spoilt. It was a well known fact of history that India was not a homogeneous family, and was never so at any time even in the past.

Aryans, Muslims and Dravidians were never one family. They had been clubbed together as one because of the fact that they had all come under a common alien Government. This artificial unity was harmful to the interests of Muslims and Dravidians, and that was why they were asking for separation. This demand for separation had, it was natural, created a feeling of dislike and bitterness in the minds of Aryans whose were the vested interests which would be affected by such separation. The Aryans were getting along smoothly leading a life of ease and comfort, without any principles, while the Dravidians and Muslims had to

labour at the sweat of their brow This unfair state of things would be changed if there was a partition of India

Demand for Partition

In short, the demand for partition is only a demand that exploitation of one race by another should cease that the domination over, and subjection of, one class by another should no longer continue

Aryans had no voice in this partition question They had no right to say either that a partition should be made or that it should not be made

Muslims were asking that the regions in which they were in a great majority should be formed into a distinct State They were asking this from the British Government not from the Aryans The attempt of Aryans to perpetuate their domination and exploitation was like that of an illegitimate son of a rich man who got control of the father's properties and wanted to continue his unholy and illegal control and possession of the properties in spite of the demand of the legitimate sons for partition of the properties to which they were the lawful heirs

Dravidian Demand

The Dravidians like the Muslims were asking that the regions which their ancestors and forefathers had, according to history ruled and enjoyed, should be formed into a Dravidian State, which alone would help the progress and prosperity of the Dravidians And Aryans had no right to stand in the way of the progress and advancement of Dravidians or Muslims

After all what claims had the Aryans except that they betrayed the land of the Dravidians and Muslims into the hands of the Britishers ?

It might be recalled that Mr Gandhi had stated that he had no objection to partition if there was a real demand, as the Congress had been fighting for the principle of self-determination But Mr Rajagopalachariar was talking in parables of cutting the mother, cutting the child cutting the cow, and so on Mr Satyamurthi said that those who wanted to dismember the house ought to be sent out Mr Savarkar said that those who demanded partition should be put down by force By what right did these persons talk like this? Is it not by

the right of the man who came with the begging bowl in his hands and wanted to become the son-in-law of the house?

As Old as the Vedas

It might be pointed out that the Aryan-Dravidian question is as old as the Vedas. That Dravidians had been suffering numerous hardships and humiliations on account of the Aryans, that they considered Aryans in fact, as their enemies, was evident from ancient tamil works

Even today, the Aryan treated the Dravidian as an inferior by birth, as untouchable, as chandalas. He said this was the law laid down by God in the shastras, and all men should obey it. From the time Aryans gained a foothold in this land, Dravidians had been treated as inferiors and they continued down the ages to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water. In such circumstances, there were found Dravidians who evidently had no faith in their birth as Dravidians, who began to worship Aryans as their religious Gurus and political prophets. There could be no greater disgrace to the Dravidian community than this state of affairs.

Can India be called Bharata Desa?

In India, the difference between Dravidians and Arya Varta was clearly marked and literary and historical works bore unmistakable evidence of such definite demarcation and division. In the face of such authentic and irrefutable facts it was simply foolish to contend that Dravida Nad formed part of Bharata Desa. When did Bharata rule over Dravida Nad? At no time in history did the Dravidian land come under the sway or suzerainty of any King called Bharat. No doubt for sometime, in some places, Muslim rule was established, but it could not be said that Muslims ruled Dravida Nad as they did the Aryavarta for centuries. As a matter of fact, Dravidian Kings established suzerainty over some portions of Aryavarta but Aryan Kings, particularly a King called Bharata, never ruled over Dravida Nad. As a result of Aryan manoeuvres and machinations, the descendants of the ancient Dravidian Kings became practically the slaves of the Aryans, came to consider themselves an inferior race, and Aryan names were given to the Dravida Nad.

Snake and the Frog

Now Dravidian society was in the position of a frog which was rapidly being swallowed up by a snake. The snake was Aryanism. Dravidian culture and civilisation were being destroyed by Aryanism. How best could the Dravidian frog be saved from the Aryan snake? The only way to save its life was to kill the snake. Unless Aryanism was cut into pieces and destroyed, Dravidianism could not be saved. In such circumstances, who would say that it was a sin to kill the snake?

What was the position of Dravidians in their own Dravida Nad? Dravidians were the hewers of wood and drawers of water, they were the underdogs in every department of life. They were the agriculturists, the labourers, the men who earned their bread at the sweat of their brow. Did any one see an Aryan ploughing the land, harvesting the crop, driving a cart, or working as a peon? Did Aryans do any work which brought perspiration to the body or caused dirt to gather at the tips of the finger-nails? Well, that was the difference between the lives of the Aryans and the Dravidians.

The Aryans called Dravidians, Sudras and Dravidian women Sudrachis. The servants in Aryan houses were Dravidians. Aryans were economically many, many times superior to Dravidians. They revelled in diamonds and gold, while Dravidians wore very cheap ornaments. About 90 per cent of Dravidians were illiterate, while 90 per cent of Aryans were highly literate. In regard to appointments, 90 per cent of the lower appointments such as peons, thothis, thalayaris and policemen, were held by Dravidians but 90 per cent of the higher appointments such as Collectors, Superintendents, and High Court Judges were held by Aryans. Dravidians were thus in the position of underdogs in their own land.

Did the Congress do anything to improve and ameliorate the condition of the Dravidians?

The real remedy was the separation of the Dravidian land and the creation of an autonomous and sovereign Dravidian State. Under a separated Dravidian State, the Aryans could not treat Dravidians as Mlechas, Rakshasas, Sudras, etc. Aryans asked, "Why should India be partitioned?" Dravidians asked, "Why should we be in a perpetual position of degradation with you? Why should not we remain separate and keep our ancient dignity and prestige?"

The partition of India on a racial basis was bound to happen, whether Aryans liked it or not

Even to-day, India was divided into varying sovereign States. There were about 584 Indian States, which were not subject to the laws and regulations obtaining in British India. There were also autonomous sovereign territories such as French India, Portuguese India, Nepal, Afghanistan etc. Did anyone protest against these divisions and partitions till now? Was not Burma separate? Was not Ceylon separate? Was not India divided into eleven provinces? Did not Congressmen themselves divide the Madras Presidency into four provinces—Tamil Nad, Andhra Desa, Kerala and Karnataka?

What was the advantage of having separation? Travancore and Mysore States had shown how, on account of a separate existence they were able to improve to such an extent that they were called model states. As regards communal troubles, they were not much in evidence in Indian States as compared with British India.

Ceylon and Burma were separated from India, and the result was that they were able to look after the welfare and well-being of their people and drive out those whom they considered as exploiters. In the Dravidian land, Marwaris, Gujarathis and Multanis had been exploiting, but the Dravidians had no right to ask them to go. It was stated that Erode Multanis donated about Rs 500 for the Hindu Mahasabha Conference, that Salem Gujarathis and Multanis gave Rs 500 for the same purpose. To spread Hindi in Dravidian land, lakhs and lakhs of rupees were given by Marwaris, Gujarathis and Multanis yearly. Rs 20 to Rs 30,000 was spent for the Hindi Prachara Sabha, and these amounts were donated by the Aryan exploiters.

These things were being done to perpetuate the exploitation of Dravidians. Every year crores and crores of rupees were being practically plundered and taken away to the North. A Dravidian might go to Bombay, work in a leather shop, and live in a slum under the most insanitary conditions of life, but the kinsmen of Patel, Desai, Birla and Bhabha came to Madras and lived like lords.

These things would be prevented if Dravida Nadi is separated like Burma or Ceylon. Exploitation by Aryans would no longer be possible.

treatment of Muslims and Mlechas and Dravidians as Sudras would be a forgotten memory.

It was of course true that there were some prominent men in the Justice Party who were opposed to the creation of a Dravidian State, but they opposed it not because they did not want such a state on the merits, but because they felt that such an idea might stand in the way of their realising their own personal ambitions in the political field.

As regards the British Government, they should realise betimes that the demand for a separate Dravidian State was made in the best interests of the people and they should see their way to concede it in the near future. They should realise that the Dravidian people were determined to separate themselves from the Aryans and free themselves once and for all from Aryan domination, and they would do even if it meant wading through rivers of blood

Partition of India, The Proper Solution

By Mr Gopaul Chetty, Late Editor, "New Reformer", Madras
in 'The Sunday Observer,' May 5 1940

Regarding concessions of political rights and privileges to India on democratic lines the problem is fraught with so many practical difficulties and is so closely connected with the social and religious divisions into which India is divided that it is only a student of Indian Sociology in its innumerable ramifications and differences between caste and caste, race and race, sect and sect that one can realize the difficulties and dangers of transplanting representative institutions successfully in Indian soil. Although these difficulties were brought to the notice of the British Government, they in pursuance of their progressive policy granted provincial autonomy two and a half years ago expecting that nationhood would be gained, that a sound electoral-system and truly representative institutions would be evolved in time. But the whole system has proved to be a thorough failure, owing to the misrule of the Congress Ministries and the British Government has now come to understand the serious error they committed in granting these political reforms.

Lord Zetland in the recent debate in the House of Lords said that the Congress Party have raised in the minds of many Muslims, apprehensions which only they themselves can allay. Lord Crewe said that he was convinced that the more extreme members of the Congress Party were looking forward to the establishment of something like an oligarchy rather than anything we should call a popular Government.

The Congress Ministries never thought as their foremost duty to effect social and religious reforms, to remove the ignorance of the masses by extension of education so that they might be fit to be the electors and the elected and to improve the economic condition of the poorer classes but did many things for oppressing the Dravidians and Mohammedans and thus gave room for fear and distrust of them and thus increased the disunion which has been the curse of India from the very beginning.

As the electoral system and representative institutions have proved to be a thorough failure, the Dravidians and Muhammadans have no confidence in the Constituent Assembly proposed by the Congress for any further instalment of responsible Government .

Mr Jinnah speaks of the partition of India as the proper solution of the problem. The Dravidians agree with him fully. The Congress contradicts itself by objecting to the proposal because it has been advocating the division into linguistic provinces. The partition is not going to increase strife. It is only when people of different races live together, all the troubles arise, but not when they live separately.

Besides the eleven provinces excluding Burma and Ceylon, in all there are about 170 States with whom the Government of India has direct dealings through its agents, but the actual number of territories which have a right to call themselves "Native States" is close on 700. What is required is the reduction of the eleven provinces into three.

"The way out," Lord Snell declared, "would be to institute in the minds of the Indian people the idea of another religion, of a common faith and loyalty to motherland as a whole, to regard India as a thing that unites them rather than their special interpretations of religions as something which divides them."

Real unity between the Hindus and Muhammadans is impossible. Once a big attempt was made by Akbar. He gathered round him the best men of his time like Faize, Abdul Fazel etc. They were set to work upon the translation of the Hindu Epics, Sastras, books of philosophy etc. The pride of the Rajput race was conciliated by taking in marriage the princesses of Jaipur and Jodhpur and by conferring equal and superior commands on those princesses. The Emperor himself guided by such counsel of his Hindu and Muhammadan nobles became the real founder of the Union between two races and this policy for a hundred years guided and swayed the Councils of the Empire. A fusion of the two races was sought to be made firmer still by the establishment of a religion of *Din-I-Ilahi* in which the best points both of the Muhammadan, Hindu and other faiths were sought to be incorporated. To conciliate his subjects, Akbar abjured the use of flesh and joined in the religious rites observed by the Hindu Queens. This process of removing all causes of friction and establishing accord went on without interruption during the

reigns of Jehangir and Shajehan In spite of all these arrangements, the union of the Hindus and Muhammadans became impossible There is not the slightest hope of the Hindus and Muhammadans uniting in future and forming one nation, while the Hinds themselves among themselves can never do so Under these circumstances, the best thing to do would be to divide India into Aryan India, Dravidian India and Muhammadan India

India was always divided into fifty-six states The term India was unknown to the Hindus. That was a name given to this country after the advent of the British people There is no authority for the Aryans to say that it was called Bharata Nadu We learn from history that Aryavarttha is the name given to the place in Northern India where Aryans lived In very early times, the whole country between the Himalayas and Cape Commorin was called Tamil Naidu as a stanza in *Purananuru* says But later on another stanza in another book says "Tamil prevails within the four limits of Venketam, Kumari and the Seas" Tamilakam or the land of the Tamils thus seems to have extended to East and West from sea to sea, and North from Tirupathu Hills to Cape Commorin and to have included the modern States of Travancore and Cochin and the British District of Malabar

Let us next see how the racial problem was solved in Europe, and U S A Canada and Ulster supply very good examples of the way in which the racial problem can be and has been solved French Canadians in the Quebec Province joined the Dominion of Canada because they possessed an overwhelming majority in that Province and their predominance in the Quebec Legislature was therefore assured It was easy to separate Ulster from the rest of Ireland because the overwhelming majority of the people were Protestants Some of the new States of Europe created since the last war of 1914-1918, illustrate this tendency towards organic States The Constitutions of Latvia, of Esthonia, of Lithuania have worked smoothly and without friction because the problems there are exclusively simple There are no racial conflicts, no communal wranglings or religious bitterness The states are founded on the willing and enthusiastic devotion of the people united by the bonds of race, religion and culture

In other organic and unitary States like France, England and Germany, the conditions are the same. Economic problems of vast magnitude may arise but they relate to questions that arise not out of

differences of race and religion. The entire out-look in these countries is different from that of Austro-Hungary before the war of 1914-1918. Any one who has studied the working of the Austro-Hungarian constitution of the days preceding last War will realize the immense difficulty and enormous complexity which made sound Parliamentary Government almost impossible. So powerful were the centrifugal forces among the different races and religions that the Government broke down completely during that War and the empire was shattered. On the ruins of the Austro-Hungarian Empire were founded the modern states of Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary and Poland. The conflicting claims of nationality and culture found their solution in separation.

Thus the ultimate results of the war of races and creeds in Austro-Hungary was the dissolution of the Empire and the creation of organisms in which various races expressed themselves in the form of nation States. It may be objected that the four states were later on conquered by others. The answer is that if they were under the control of one powerful nation, enjoying independence otherwise, they would not have been conquered.

The case of India is analogous to that of Austria and we may further say that it is much more complex.

Under these circumstances the best policy would be to divide India into Aryan India, Dravidian India and Muhammadan India. To prevent the conquest of these organic States they must continue to be under the control of the British Government. If India had been a homogeneous country and had been distinguished by the unity of cultural, economic and political and other interests which characterises England, France or Germany, this question of partition would never have arisen. But it is not an organic State and it will never be and artificial unity is of no use.

Dravidian Regions Should Form A Separate State

By Mr A C Balasundara Nayakar, B A , L T in "The Sunday Observer"
April 7, 1940

The proposal mooted by Sir Mahomed Iqbal some years ago for the division of India into Racial Regions has at last come to stay. The Muslim League has adopted it as the basis of any future constitution of India. We have read very carefully the resolution of the League Conference dealing with this subject. We find therein reason, deliberation, wisdom and, more than all, a sincere desire to be just to others and to convince them of the justice of the demand. We do not find the least trace of equivocation or hypocrisy. The President of the League has stated clearly the reasons that justify the position taken up by it. For nearly a thousand years the Hindus and Muslims of India have lived together, but there has been no fusion of these two communities. Each has remained in water-tight compartments, and has guarded its integrity and purity with scrupulous care and devotion. They have their separate religions, cultures and social orders. If a thousand years of close contact, and a hundred and fifty years of a common British Rule could not mix them, Mr Jinnah claims that the formation of a United India in any near future would be a vain dream. No sane man could call that argument unsound or consider it a sign of diseased mentality. Only hypocrites, who are in despair of finding arguments to refute Mr Jinnah's conclusions, could call that a mischievous lead to Indian Muslims.

Mr Gandhi's View

We are surprised to note how Mr Gandhi tries to meet this two-nation theory of Mr Jinnah. He maintains that the Muslims of India with very few exceptions are Hindus converted to Islam, and that therefore all of them in common with the Hindus belong to one and the same race. Most probably a secret wish or hope is lurking in the heart of the "Mahatma" that all these 8 crores of Indian Muslims will one day find themselves re-converted to Hinduism by the Shuddhi and Sangathan movements of Northern India. May the Giver of all Good prevent

Muslims from such a cruel calamity of coming under the Order of Sanathana Dharma and being vivisected and tortured by that inhuman Social Order. If Mr Gandhi and his companions do entertain any such hopes, or think of driving out the Muslims out of India thus making India the home-land of the Hindus always subject to the Hindu Raj, they are certainly after a delusion. The Indian Muslims have come to stay in India, they have made it their homeland, and there is no earthly power that can make them withdraw from this country peacefully or otherwise. On the other hand, it is possible for the whole of India being overrun by the Muslims the moment the British bayonet is removed from India.

Position Justified

It is then the duty of every Hindu Leader of the Country to examine closely the two nation theory of Mr Jinnah and see if that is not a reasonable and just proposal. Mr Jinnah has very often stressed that the Muslims of India were second to none in their desire to serve the best interests of India, that the Muslim League stood for full national self-government for the people of India, but that the Muslims considered that there could be no real national government unless and until the rights and interests of the minorities are protected and safeguarded by honourable settlement, so as to create a sense of security in them and win their trust and confidence in the majority rule. He has put forward many suggestions in this regard which were called his 14 points, 21 points etc., but every time he came out with a proposal for settlement with the Hindus, he was thwarted by flat refusals from Congress leaders to recognise the status and authority of the great Muslim Leader, and by setting up every time a few Muslim hirelings in the Congress Camp to repudiate and disclaim his authority and representative character. Can there be a greater insult to the great Muslim community, which is not a mere minority community like the Parsis but a community with an ancient military tradition, which was the Ruling Race in India before the advent of the British, and whose rule was so beneficial for the country that Mr Gandhi himself spoke in praise of it a few weeks ago. Is it any wonder therefore that Mr Jinnah threw off his 14 points, and holds up the proposal of Sir Mahomed Iqbal as a satisfactory solution of the Hindu Muslim problem? There could be no other go for him in the face of the defiant and insulting attitude of the Mahatma and the Congress High Command.

Muslim States

Let us now closely examine the proposal. The resolution of the Muslim League demands the formation of the Muslim State in the North West and another in the East of India. In this connection, it must be remembered that in the North-West of India there are Sind, Baluchistan, North West Frontier Province and the Punjab whose populations are wholly or predominantly Muslim and that there is the Indian State of Kashmir and Jammu the majority of whose population are Muslims. Add to those the smaller Indian States in these 4 British Indian provinces, the whole block can well be constituted into a Muslim State.

Again in the eastern part of our sub-continent there are Bengal and Assam whose populations are predominantly Muslim. Add to these Manipur and the small Indian States found in these two British Indian provinces and the whole might be grouped into another big Muslim State. The creation of these Muslim States will give entire satisfaction to the Indian Muslims. In fact these are the states envisaged in the resolution of the Muslim League conference at Lahore. The eastern region may be called East Muslimstan and the western region West Muslimstan.

Other States

We now turn to the non-Muslim population of India. They belong to many races. Some of them are too small to think of separate provinces for themselves. But there are two big racial groups. The populations of United Provinces, Bihar, Orissa, Central India Agency and Guzerat are predominantly Hindu and contain almost all the important places of pilgrimage, and sacred shrines and rivers of the Hindus. The Indian States of Rajputana contain predominantly Hindu populations and may be easily persuaded to join this group of British Indian provinces. The whole region might be formed into big Hindu State and be called Hindustan.

All the British Indian provinces and the Indian States below the Hindustan can be conveniently grouped into another region. These states and provinces lie wholly on the south of the Vindhya. They are the British Indian provinces of Madras, Bombay, Central Provinces, Berar, the Agency of Coorg and the States of Hyderabad, Mysore, Cochin, Travancore, and the smaller states of these two British Indian provinces. The majority of the populations of all these states, Indian

or British Indian, including the Mahrattas of the Bombay Presidency, claim to be Dravidians and speak one or the other of the Dravidian languages. Their cultures, traditions and civilizations are separate and distinct from those of the Aryans. The population of those who claim to be non-Dravidian in this region is very insignificant. In these conditions, these states might be formed into a separate region called Dravidistan.

Strategic Positions

Having suggested the convenient and natural ways of dividing of India according to the races that inhabit it, let us now look into the strategic positions of these regions. The Muslims of the Western region will be happy to occupy a position contiguous to that of their Afghan brethren, which will facilitate commercial and other relations with them. There could be no possible invasion of the Hindustan by the Muslims of this region with the help of their Afghan or Arabian brethren so long as India remains under the banner of England. But even after that, the people of Hindustan could resist any such invasion with the help of the people of Dravidistan. But such fears are absolutely groundless, the Indian Muslims want to live in peace with their Hindu neighbours, and do not desire to dominate them. Let us hear what Mr Jinnah says in this connection. 'There is no reason why these states should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand, the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of one to dominate social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the Government of the country will disappear. My proposal will tend to create natural goodwill through international pacts between them, and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours.' As for the southern state of Dravidistan, the Vindhya will afford, as in the days of old, ample protection from foreign invasion and aggression.

Division Equitable

It now behoves us to examine whether this method of division will be equitable from the point of view of population. The western Muslimstan including the Muslim States in it will have a population of about 5 crores, and the Eastern Muslimstan, a population of 6 crores, so that the two Muslim states will have a total population of 11 crores. The Hindustan including the Indian States will have a population of about 11 crores, and the Dravidistan including the Indian States will have a population of about 11 crores. This is a very equitable distribution of the Indian population.

Object of Division

We now come to the form of the Government that may be construed in these regions. This is in fact the most important and at the same time the most difficult problem. It will have to be considered from several points of view. Firstly what does the Muslim League want to gain by the formation of these Muslim States? The resolution concerning this says: We want our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in the way we think best in consonance with our own ideas and according to the genius of our people. Granted, does the Muslim League then want a state in which there will be no Hindus? Does it want to transfer all the Hindus of the two Muslim regions to the non-Muslim regions and *vice versa*? Absolutely not, and that is not at all practicable or desirable. The Muslims of Bengal who love their province and the Bengalee language dearly will surely refuse to leave Bengal, just in the same way as the Germans of Lithuania refused to come over to Germany. Besides, there is no reason for the Hindus living in these Muslim States to entertain any fears for their life, liberty or property. Do not Muslims live peacefully and happily under the aegis of the Maharaja of Mysore and other Hindu Princes? And do not the Hindus live as peacefully and as happily under the aegis of the Nizam of Hyderabad and the other Muslim Princes? Has not Mr. Gandhi stated a few days ago that the Hindus and Muslims lived in peace and amity with each other before the advent of the British under the Muslim kings? How then could these Muslim States of mixed population help the Muslims to achieve Mr. Jinnah's aim? Mr. Jinnah desires a pure and unmixed Muslim administration in the Muslim States. There will then be no unhealthy and often troublesome rivalry between them and the other minorities in the governance of the states. But of course Mr. Jinnah desires that adequate, efficient and mandatory safeguards should be provided in the constitution for the protection of all other interests of the minorities. The Hindus and the Dravidians will enjoy similar privileges in the matter of the governance of their states. What more safeguards would the Hindus like to have from the Muslims of India? Has any Hindu Leader hitherto given such reasonable and just assurances to the Muslims unequivocally and unquestionably? Immediately after the Mahatma wrote in the "Harijan" that he would be ruled by Indian Muslims, Mr. Savarkar harangues that India should be always under the Hindu Raj and that, if the Muslims do not like it, they might quit the country.

Government of Regions

We now turn towards the form of government that would be most suitable to these big regions. The government of each region would be a Federation, whose units will be the states, Indian and British Indian. It does not matter if all the federating units do not possess a uniform type of government, and still they may have a common government for some common and mutually beneficial purposes, such as defence, foreign relations, communications, customs etc. Do not Scotland and England have a common government in spite of their having two separate and distinct churches? When religious considerations do not stand in the way of a common government for the common earthly good, why should differences in the form of government be regarded as an insuperable obstacle in the way of that object? Of course effective safeguards will have to be provided in these federal constitutions for the protection of the interests of the minorities both in the regions and the federating units.

Government of India

Now we come to the last phase of this complex constitutional problem. It would be for the greatest good of these four big federal states to have a common government for the whole of India, for the purpose of the defence of the whole country and its foreign relations and such other matters which may be necessary. These four states might form into a confederacy, which might remain a dominion of Great Britain untill it becomes so strong and skilful as to be able to protect its shores from foreign invasion or aggression without the help of the British forces and arms. It would be sheer madness to say that we could learn to protect our freedom after the Britisher goes, refusing to utilise the wisdom and knowledge mankind has obtained after so much of valuable sacrifice. Such thoughtless and impatient suggestions can help us only to find ourselves as slaves of a selfish, haughty and unscrupulous conqueror.

In the end, we find the proposal of Mr. Jinnah to be very reasonable, so far-sighted and just scheme for the complete liquidation of the present differences between the Hindus and the Muslims, and for the establishment of a lasting peace and prosperity to all the peoples of India. We heartily welcome the proposal and feel grateful to the Quaid I Azam for discovering the right solution for the ills of India and for

United States of India

Pakistan Scheme—India's Remarkable Revolution

(By Tarun Bhattacharya, formerly editor, Associated Press and
Reuter, "International Times", 'Tarun Assam' etc)

'The Assam Herald' 11th May 1940

Amidst complicated international situation, the Pakistan scheme of the All India Muslim League has provided for India's remarkable, silent and effective Resolution. To a patriot—a true lover of India, Hindustan and Pakistan should strike as sacrosanct names over which squabbles in the Press of India mostly owned by Hindus are wantonly childish. Hindus will not lose their religion by living in Pakistan, just as they did not lose their religion by staying under Moghul India, similarly Moslems will retain their religion by their existence in Hindustan. The glory of their faith—their solidarity is left untouched in Soviet Russia and China, it should be adorable to India. I am confident that these two separate independent units of Moslem-India and Hindu-India in the process of their fullest developments will inevitably lead to the formation of the United States of India akin to that of the United States of America.

Since both the Moslem League and Congress are agreed to attaining freedom after the present war the interval bestows on us an opportunity for a fundamental change of out-look and of agreeing to the Pakistan Scheme—the only practical method of achieving Hindu-Moslem harmony, without which India cannot be free. It is desirable because it enables us to cease the war of recrimination against each other that usually leads to fratricidal wars and makes our mutual war of liberation possible by active participation in the war with the Allies.

If Moslems containing eight crores of population ranking almost the population in Germany demand for an autonomous state their proposal is just and sensible. Enforce on them any humiliating measure of subservience affecting their solidarity a blunder of the type of Treaty of Versailles is inflicted on them. To me Moslem India provides the nucleus of a friendly or hostile Germany in India. Pakistan does not dismember India, rather it harmonises Hindus and Mussalmans on equal

footing and envisages the possibility of purchasing freedom of India from foreign domination at the cheapest price. Any other insidious method of taking Moslem India to Hindu India provokes rancour, jealousy and suspicion amongst these two communities and dashes the hopes of freedom and causes complete dismemberment of India which Hindus and Mohamedans will be equally held responsible.

While Congress demands an autonomous India, can she be true to her political protestation if the legitimate aspirations of Mahomedans are not fulfilled for their own autonomous home and state in India. For this object, a referendum among the Muslim population should be the decisive factor to which Congress and the British Government cannot but surrender. We have tried all expedients including the recent mass contact movement to unite Hindus and Mussalmans for more than fifty years since the birth of Congress and have failed. Truly a great majority of Mahomedan population considers now the Muslim League and not the Congress as their only political organisation. Simply because there are a sprinkling of Mohamedan Congress adherents or some Mussalmans appreciating Congress view points, can we the exponents of true national unity, Hindu unity, Moslem unity and of Swaraj that never imperishes for the sake of a section of Congress followers sacrifice the aspirations of an overwhelming homogeneous majority of Mahomedan population and accept the onus of responsibility for serving the seeds of disintegration among Moslems? The life dedication of Mahatma Gandhi has upto now failed to harmonise the Hindus completely, surely it will pierce his heart to see a similar process of disintegration among Moslems. If to Hindus Turkey appears to be an ideal Moslem State for emulation, why should they pounce upon the possible creation of such a state by their Moslem brethren in the homeland of India? It is a proud moment in our national life to proclaim let "Moslem India" and "Hindu India" shape their own destinies of freedom. Let the mass be awakened by their respective sacrifices services and work of Reconstruction. For the liberation of India and resisting any possible future invasion, our greatest peace offensive amidst devastating wars in Europe should be directed forwards the creation of an ideal "Pakistan" and "Hindustan" that may blossom on any day as the United States of India.

The desideratum of India is not merely achieving freedom from Great Britain but its retention with the aid of a new balance of Mohamedan powers which are rapidly growing from Egypt to Afghanistan with

Turkey as its pivot. Naturally, Pakistan can consolidate their alliance for the safety and protection of India. A new Moslem state in India will resuscitate them with a momentum that can dispel with confidence any possible German Italian and Soviet aggression. To India, a great opportunity has occurred to cultivate everlasting friendship of mutual assistance with the Mahomedan powers of the world to whom Europe is at present looking as a bulwark of support. If the Muslim League is burnt with the aspiration that in India they desire to build up as powerful a Moslem state as Turkey, they should be welcomed to do so. *The Indian National Congress* should embrace her as a powerful sister organisation. This does not go against India. International situation demands that side by side with a powerful Moslem India a Hindu India should grow. Then freed from internecine strife and eventually from foreign domination *Muslim India and Hindu India* may form the basis of the United States of India. Possibly, on the event of dawning of such understanding Mahatma Gandhi says —If Pakistan is a desirable goal why should it be prevented? *I would do anything to bring harmony*. My life is made up of compromises but there have been compromises that have brought me nearer the goal. Pakistan cannot be worse than foreign domination. I have lived under the latter though not willingly. If God so desires it, I may have to become a helpless witness to the undoing of my dream. But I do not believe that the Muslims *really* want to dismember India.

Pakistan: An Ideal Or Practical Politics To-day?

By I. H. Qureshi, in the "Eastern Times", 9th August 1940

While Pt Jawaharlal Nehru was, as usual, glibly telling the world that the Pakistan Scheme was dead and gone, Khawaja Sir Nazim-ud-Din was quietly asserting in the Bengal Assembly that Pakistan alone could give the Province an army of its own if it had set its heart on having one, while Mr Aney was thundering in the Hindu League inaugural meeting against the Scheme, Nawabzada Liaqat Ali Khan was affirming Baluchistan's faith in it at the Provincial Conference at Quetta and while the Bengal Hindus were clamouring for a Constituent Assembly, the Mysore State Muslim League was passing resolutions in favour of Pakistan

Now what is the truth with regard to the Muslim League Scheme? Is it dead as Nehru says or alive and kicking? Is it a mirage, a chimera, mere wishful thinking or practical politics and the only remedy for all our ills? Is the All-India Muslim League itself serious about it or does it merely regard (as some assert) as a counter for bargaining with the Hindus? What does the world think of it? What are its prospects? What should be our attitude towards it? These and similar questions arise instantly in one's mind when coming across diametrically opposite views as mentioned above. Let us think the matter over in some detail

The Idea of Pakistan, it is well known, originated in the brain of the late Hazrat Allama Iqbal. It at once met with hostile criticism and even ridicule. It was said that the Poet-Philosopher of Islam had, like all other poets, allowed his imagination to run away with his reason. That the idea was no more than a poetical flight and that it had no practical value. It was, however, conveniently forgotten that a man like Iqbal was not a mere poetaster, he was something more than that. He was, in fact, the embodiment of the highest intellect of Indian Islam. He represented in his person the best that was in his nation. He was the mirror of his age. He was the mouth-piece of the highest aspirations of his people. He was a seer and could express the genius of Muslim

India through his magic words. He was not merely a poet or a philosopher but a 'Mujadid' destined to instruct, guide and renovate the Mussalmans of this era.

United Demand

The Pakistan idea therefore was not the idea of a single person but the expression of the collective will of a people. Every thinking Muslim in India wanted desperately to find a way out of the darkness and gloom that surrounded him and yearned for light. Only most of them could not grasp at the real remedy nor yet express what was in their innermost hearts. But the prayer of Muslim India was not in vain. Dr Iqbal made articulate what was so far struggling for expression.

That his critics were uneasy that such was the case is evident from the fact that they tried to belittle and pour ridicule upon it. But the ideals of a nation cannot be killed by derisive laughter. In one day the Muslims of India had found their goal and they were not going to abandon it because others did not like it. Of course at first Dr Mohd Iqbal's idea was taken up by a few persons only. A person here and there was attracted to it, a person here and there was struck by it. But the idea grew. It grew and grew and presently the whole Muslim nation was talking of it, discussing it and digesting it. And finally they became unanimous over it.

It was then that the All India Muslim League took notice of it. The demand for such a course had become practically irresistible. The Pakistan idea is not the brain wave of Dr Iqbal, much less of Mr Mohd Ali Jinnah, as the enemies of Islam assert to-day. It is a calumny to accuse the League President of misleading the Muslims by preaching to them of Pakistan. It is the unanimous voice of Islam in India that demands Pakistan! The League, as the sole political organisation of Muslims, could not but make it the main plank of its programme.

Now about the Muslim League scheme. Many critics point out that the League has done no more than pass a resolution, that it has not even completed the scheme which it had before it, that the League is not serious about it and so forth. One may however ask whether this criticism is reasonable, particularly since it comes also from friends of the League. Can such a scheme be framed in a hurry at all? The League has placed an ideal before the Mussalmans

and affirmed its unalterable resolve to stand by it and to pursue it under all circumstances and all costs. That is all that there is to it, for the present. The League has to educate the public with regard to it, propagate its ideal, convince the world that Pakistan alone can bring peace and prosperity to India. That done, the rest will not be difficult.

The League Scheme

Of course, the Indian Mussalmans will have to make tremendous sacrifices for the attainment of Pakistan. The League has to prepare them for that. Therefore, I say to the impatient youth, be not concerned with the details of the scheme. No cut and dried scheme can be formed. Who knows what shape Pakistan will finally take and in what form it will emerge from the turmoil of the years? The League has in a general way indicated the scheme of partitioning India into Hindu and Muslim zones. No more than that. To describe the scheme as the creation of Pakistan and Hindusthan is itself a misnomer.

The final shape of Pakistan will be decided with the consent of the Hindus, or if that is not available by the right arm of united Muslim India. That final shape is in the womb of the future Pakistan, let us frankly admit, is not practical politics to-day. Our fellow countrymen are not in a mood for compromise. Let us not therefore, I say, bother about the details of the scheme. Let us not also be despondent that Pakistan is not readily attainable. We must, however, take note of the trend of events in the world to-day. World opinion is becoming practically unanimous that the question of nationalities can only be decided by giving them distinct and separate home lands. Of course, there is a further tendency, to give them their home-lands and then to combine them into a greater whole into some sort of federation. Only mixture of nations has proved a failure. At present nations and races are being confused together and the question is regarded as "racial." It is, however, being rapidly recognised that there are no such things as pure races. What are being described as race are in reality nations. Inter-connected is the question of the minorities. Transfer of populations, en masse, is being tried with conspicuous success.

It is reasonable to hope that the process will be applied in the near future on an ever-increasing scale, till it becomes the only way out of the present-day difficulties of the world. Then, it will be time to apply the method in India. Many people are appalled at the thought,

The tremendous upheaval unnerves them and they despair. But that mentality will have to be outlived. Desperate ills require desperate remedies. To save lives, serious surgical operations are necessary.

A Glorious Ideal

What of the Muslim League Scheme then? As I read it, the All-India Muslim League has placed before the Muslim youth a great ideal. So far, the Muslims invariably lacked such a goal. Their lives were aimless. Swaraj for them had no attraction. Whereas the Hindus, extremists, moderates and reactionaries, had all one aim and object, the Muslims had none. Hindu terrorists killed and died for Swaraj, Hindu co-operators sycophantically worked for it. Congress fought for it, Hindu Mahasabha intrigued for it. Mahatmas, Communists, orthodox, heretics, every Hindu, in short, worked for Swaraj. Muslims, I repeat, had no ideal. Some of them were victims of fear and inertia, others out of sheer boredom turned "nationalists". Some dreamed of Pan-Islamism, some despaired of life itself. Now all this has changed. The League has given a glorious ideal to the Mussalmáns. We can live for it, work for it, dream of it, and above all, die for it—die for it, so that a rejuvenated, regenerated, renovated and triumphant Islam may once again raise its head in this land of ours and live an honourable and peaceful life.

Can Hindus and Muslims Ever Become One Nation?

By Wahid Ashraf, in "Star of India" April 1st 1940

There has lately arisen a great cry from the Hindu Press and platforms that Hindus and Muslims of India are one nation. Let us try and see from the purely scientific point of view if it is possible to unite Hindus and Muslims and make them into one nation. We are given examples of South Africa and Canada where two different nations became united and formed one nation. We are told about Egypt where the Muslims and Christians joined hands and became a nation of Egyptians. Let us see what is the fundamental psychological factor present in India which has kept the Hindus and Muslims apart, as two distinct and separate nations and which must, for ever, continue to be so.

Let us take a plain example which is an everyday experience of the lay man. Everyone knows that it is the impressions and habits formed during childhood that last for life. Some psychologists go so far as to say that it is the first years of a child's life that are important from the point of view of forming good or bad habits. Now, let us take for example the case of a child whose parents have told him from his very infancy day in and day out keep it dinning in his ears, that he must never touch a book, that if he does so, even by mistake, then no one will love him or speak to him, that he will be turned out of his home and despised by all his friends and relatives, shunned by society and forsaken by God.

Further, he finds that all his relatives and other people whom he knows, scrupulously avoid touching or reading any book and show nothing but antipathy towards any book they may see in some book-stall. If the same process continues during his whole life, what would be the result? Would it be reasonable to expect such a child ever to handle any book or to develop any love for reading? Everyone knows how a child has to be told repeatedly from his earliest days of the value of reading books and of how others have become famous by reading hard, how his interest has to be stimulated by promising to give him sweets

etc., if he learns his lesson. Later, when he enters School and College, he sees his friends winning prizes etc., the distribution of prizes being conducted before a large assembly so that the child may try to imitate in order that he also may have the same honour next time before so many people.

Working of Subconscious Mind

Now let us apply the same psychological principle to India. The Hindu child, from his very infancy, is told "Look here, this person is a Muslim. You must never allow your food or drink to be touched by him, otherwise the food will become contaminated, and if you take such food or drink, you will lose your caste, no one will love or speak to you, you will be turned out of home and be despised by everyone. You will be forsaken by all our Gods and Goddesses, be cursed by them and be punished by their wrath."

Not only that, he finds that all his people observe strict untouchability towards the Muslim. What is the result? His very first impression about a Muslim is not good. This Muslim is to be despised and kept aloof from him. In his subconscious mind, the Muslim's name becomes associated with a strong emotion of fear of losing his caste and thus being turned out of society and also falling a prey to the wrath of his Gods. The very beginning is not promising.

And what is this experience as he grows up. He goes with his father to a Hindu sweet-meat stall. A Muslim is also standing there. When the child's father buys some sweet-meats, the confectioner keeps the "dona" (package) of sweet-meats on his father's hand gently so that no sweet-meat may fall away. But at the same time, he sees that the Muslim who had also come as near the shop as he and his father were, is told by the confectioner to keep away otherwise all his sweet-meats will get contaminated, and the Muslim has to step back and keep at least a foot or so behind the others. The confectioner takes the "dona" of sweets for the Muslim and drops it into his hand from a distance of a foot or so just as you may throw a bone to a dog or give alms to a leper.

The subconscious mind of the child couples the Muslim's name with loathsomeness as his presence is so obnoxious to everyone, and this feeling is added to the emotion of fear of losing his caste, already present in his brain against the Muslim.

But this is not the only instance. He finds that whether he is buying anything eatable in a shop, or whether he is having refreshments in his school or college, whether travelling in a railway compartment or on a steamer, whether drawing water from a well or a municipal pump, he has always to be on the alert lest his food or drink may get contaminated by the touch of this Muslim? At first, he thought that this Muslim could be tolerated but by degrees due to constant contact, the Muslim is getting on his nerves, causing a feeling of irritation and resentment in his subconscious mind against his presence.

Muslim Hatred and Fear

But this is not all. He goes home and finds the women in a temper. Perhaps a crow or a cat has stolen a piece of beef or bone from the Muslim neighbour's house and dropped it on the rice that was being dried in the courtyard. Left it in the kitchen, or perhaps a hen came flying over the Muslim neighbour's roof, and though it did not actually touch the food it walked over the "chowka" (ground washed and plastered with clay before feeding), where food was being served and so the whole food had to be thrown. His loathsomeness and fear of losing his caste, increases with consequent rise of resentment and hate against this Muslim who is such a nuisance.

The great festival of 'Holi' comes. It is the time of riotous merriment. He throws mud cowdung collections from drains, vermilion and coloured-water on every passer-by till he meets someone who tells him politely but firmly that he is a Muslim and he can not allow such nonsense. He feels disgusted. His subconscious mind registers another black mark against this Muslim.

He is told that Muslims have slaughtered cows. Mother cow! A goddess (!) to be treated thus. Or perhaps, some Muslim, on a hunting trip has shot a 'Nil-gai,' or finding that his garden is being devastated by monkeys has shot one of them (another god). Instances like this occur in plenty everyday of his life. His subconscious brain feels acutely resentful against such order of things and develops acute hatred towards this Muslim. Why must he be always reminded at every turn that there is this loathsome Muslim present to contaminate his food and drink, and thus make him lose his caste and become a victim of the wrath of his gods? why is this sacrilegious Muslim in a position to kill his gods, and goddesses to disturb his peace of mind and mar his happiness? Resentment and hatred against this Muslim increases everyday of his life.

Every psychologist knows that the subconscious mind is a great deceiver

The subject himself may not know his real feelings and emotions 'repressed,' in his subconscious mind. He may talk loftily of "nationalism" and "brother Muslim" but the hatred fear and consequent resentment against his presence are there firmly entrenched in his subconscious mind. It is only when a favourable opportunity occurs that the emotions 'repressed' in the subconscious mind assert themselves and the individual, so to say shows himself in his true colour

The Reaction

Now let us see what would be the reaction of the subconscious mind having such an accumulation of hatred and resentment against any class of persons and such a strong emotion of fear of losing his caste and religion due to his touch and thus becoming a social outcaste as well as a victim of God's wrath. The reaction will depend on one single factor namely, the presence or absence of power. That is the individual will react variously according as his subconscious brain realises that it is powerless or has enough power to do what it likes. In the former case, it will only rest content with manifesting its subconscious hatred in various ways in the latter case the 'repressed' subconscious fear will also assert itself

As every psychologist knows fear can make a person do any act of meanness, violence or inhumanity. Hence in this case, his subconscious mind will exert all its power, according to the degree of his intellectual development to change the whole order of things so that this Muslim against whom his hate and resentment have been smouldering for years remains no longer in a position to do the things which he (the Hindu) has hated since his childhood. And how can it best be done? His subconscious mind is aware that he (the Hindu), is always liable to lose his caste if his food, etc., is touched by the Muslim. Then the best solution is to take this sting out of the Muslim. This can only occur if the Muslim could be made to change his faith and become a Hindu. If, however, this is not possible, then the next best thing would be, if the Muslim could be made to leave India

Conversion or Evacuation

As proof of this let us point out that when the subconscious mind of the Hindu intelligentsia first realised that the majority party rules in

the Western democracies and became aware of its own power due to the Hindus' numerical superiority, that the "Arya Samaj movement" was started to proselytise Muslims and from the platforms of which Hindus were openly incited to use violence to drive out the Muslims from India. Later, it was as early as 1921-22, when the Hindu masses first became aware of gaining political power under the Montford Scheme that age-long custom of the Hindus was thrown overboard and active proselytisation of the Muslims, on a large scale, "Shuddhi movement" was started, at the same time Hindu-Muslim riots began to occur in every place.

Hence the subconscious mind of the Hindu drives him to make the conditions so hard for the Muslim that the Muslim is either compelled to leave his religion and become a Hindu or to get out of India for good, so that the Hindu may eat, drink and enjoy life as it may please him without always having a subconscious fear of losing his caste and religion every moment of the day.

Now let us take concrete instances of both the subconscious mind realising itself powerless and that knowing it has power. We will take for our example the highest god of the Congress, namely Mr. Gandhi. Some 10 or 12 years ago, he wrote a series of articles in his weekly paper (perhaps it was the "Young India") against the "Foreigner Kabulis," who came to India and did money-lending business and thus took away Indian money. It is well-known that the so-called "Kabulis" really consist mostly of people from the N. W. F. Province and only a few from Afghanistan.

Mr. Gandhi's subconscious mind knew that they were all Muslims and that is why it hated them. But at the same time, it could not show its feeling openly, because the conscious part of Mr. Gandhi wanted to show that he was a "nationalist." Well, what could be easier than to class all these Muslims as "foreigners" and thus start a crusade against them. Needless to say, his cry was taken up by the Hindus till the Frontier Muslims lost their business and their place was taken up by the Punjabi Hindus and Sikhs.

Now let us mark one very important fact. "Foreigner Nepalese" are taken in, in their thousands in the Indian army and paid for, out of the Indian Exchequer, they also flood all Government and commercial offices and durwans, watchmen, etc. How is it that the same nationalist Gandhi has never considered it convenient to utter a word of protest

regarding the usurpation of the legitimate employment of Indians by "Foreigner Nepalese" Because his subconscious brain could not prompt him to say a word against the Nepalese who are Hindus The affair had nothing to do with "nationalism" It was only a trick of his subconscious mind to deceive him, it was conscious that it had not enough power to show its full amount of hate and do what it liked, so it only rested content with injuring the Muslims in the only way in his power, that is, economically

Now let us take the examples of the subconscious brain aware of the fact that it has power to do what it likes Let us, for the sake of clear illustrations, classify the subconscious brain into the three groups Firstly, a very highly developed and clever intellect like that of Mr Gandhi On the other extreme, are the least developed intellects like that of the villagers, labourers, etc., which form the low class In the middle, lies the grade which is neither very highly developed nor absolutely brutish As we have seen before, the subconscious mind of the Hindu is aware of his power, will be driven by its ever-present emotion of fear either to compel the Muslim to change his religion and become a Hindu or to drive him out of India Let us see how all these three classes of the subconscious mind will strive, each in its own way, according to its own degree of intellectual development, towards the consummation of the same common desire

Fires From Three Sides

Let us first consider Mr Gandhi His intellect is developed, highly enough to make clever-worded resolutions, draw up clever schemes, etc In short, he is a man of the pen, not of the "lathi" or sword He professes "non-violence," hence tries to reach the same common object by "non-violent" methods His subconscious mind knowing that if Muslim children are deprived of religious training from the very beginning, and are made to believe in the truth of all religions and place Hinduism and Islam on an equal footing, and compelled to believe in and practice Hindu ideas of "ahimsa," etc., and are forced to read books steeped in Hindu culture, etc., then such boys when they grow up will be nothing but Hindus, hence it drives him to evolve the Wardha Scheme of Education, depending on the fact that it can force the Muslims to submit quietly as Hindu Governments are in power in six provinces of India, at the same time professing loudly that religious training does not promote "national" feeling and is the cause of all communal trouble.

It is the same thing as the "Shuddhi" movement of the earlier days, but since the conscious part of Mr Gandhi's brain calls itself a "nationalist," the subconscious part must hide its real feelings under the cloak of "nationalism"

On the other extreme are the Hindu masses Their intellect is not much developed They do not know how to wield the pen cleverly. They only know how to use the "lathi" Hence when they realise that they are in power in six provinces of India their subconscious mind prompts them to use the "lathi" unhesitatingly in the furtherance of the one common aim, namely forcing the Muslims to change their religion or to get out of India Hence, we find from undisputed Government records that Hindu-Muslim clashes become at least twenty times more frequent than in the days previous to the assumption of office by the Congress.

Innumerable instances occur in every province of the stoppage of the legitimate religious and civil rights of the Muslims like forcible stoppage of "Azan" (call to prayer), of cow-slaughter during Baqrid or on other days, burning and looting of Muslim houses and villages, destruction of their life and property, demolition of mosques and other sacred places assault on women and children, forcible installation of idols in Imambaras, forcible throwing of mud, coloured water, etc, on Muslims during Holi, abusing Muslims who may happen to pass through Hindu localities, boycott of Muslims and such other instances too numerous to relate. Their intellect is not developed enough for them to hide their real feelings under the garb of "nationalism"

In the middle comes the class known as the intelligentsia They form the Ministers, their Secretaries, Members of Legislatures, of Municipal and District Boards, Government officials, etc Their brain is neither as highly developed as that of Mr Gandhi nor so low as that of the masses Hence their methods also are not as subtle as that of Mr Gandhi nor so open and brutish as that of masses Hence they carry out the schemes of Mr Gandhi on the one hand, realising subconsciously that it is a step in the right direction towards the "non-violent" conversion of the Muslims to Hinduism and on the other hand, they, having all the police, etc, in their power, whitewash and deny the oppressions and persecutions perpetrated by Hindu masses on Muslims, they even go so far as to strive themselves towards the same common aim by using sections of Criminal Procedure Code to stop cow-sacrifice,

to stop Muslims from doing certain things on the ground that there is no custom, yet allowing Hindus to go against custom, doing everything in their power to kill the Urdu language as it also contains words from Persian and Arabic, which reminds them of the Muslims and thus excites their emotions of hatred, resentment and loathsomeness, issuing circulars to primary schools for all children to worship the idol of Saraswati and the photograph of Mr Gandhi and not allowing any exemption in case of Muslims, doing injustice to Muslims in the matter of Government services appointment to local bodies, etc

Even Congressite Muslims cannot get sufficient representation as delegates to sessions of Congress nor on Municipal or District Board Committees, etc In fact, it is because they are subconsciously aware of their guilt that that they have been so vociferous against the idea of a Royal Commission, and it is for the same reason that they hastily drew up some trumped-up counter-charges against the Muslim Ministries to puzzle the British mind

India is India

From the above it is clear that there is a fundamental difference between Egypt and India In Egypt, the Muslims and Christians could at least dine at the same table, none of them was afraid of losing caste and religion at the touch of the other and thus incurring the wrath of God, hence he did not resent the presence of the other in that country

Here, as can be seen from the above, the condition is entirely the reverse There is a basic psychological difference between the two The subconscious mind of the Hindu will always remain acutely resentful and antipathic towards the presence of the Muslim in India The larger the number of the Hindu masses that become conscious of having gained power for example, by the Constituent Assembly method, the more will their subconscious hatred, resentment and fear show itself against the Muslims towards the achievement of the common aim of forcing the Muslim to change his faith or get out of India, that is the so-called political advancement of India will bring greater misery and ruin for the Muslims in its train, in the present condition

It may be said that many Hindus who have come in contact with Western civilisation do not observe untouchability with Muslims But even in their case, they must always remain under the influence of mass psychology and preserve to a very great extent the feelings of resentment,

hatred and loathsomeness instilled in their brain in their early age, as long their friends, relatives and the society in which they move, observes untouchability. Those who say that Hindu and Muslims could be combined to form one nation are shutting their eyes to scientific truths and deceiving themselves and the world.

Solution in Partition

What, under the circumstances, is the best practical solution of the problem? The political advancement of India must go on, and power must come to Indians, but what, in the light of Science, is the best way for the safety of the Muslim nation?

Is it possible to treat the subconscious mind of the individual Hindu? Impossible. No power could undertake a psycho-analysis and psychotherapy of 230 million people.

Secondly, is it possible to cultivate ideas of truth "nationalism" in the Hindu mind? It must take a long time. If all the Hindus leave untouchability to-day, then the children born after such a date, when they are grown up and are at the helm of office in the Congress and leaders of public opinion, can be expected to have a nationalistic outlook. It must take at least 50 years hence not practicable.

Thirdly division of India into Hindu India and Muslim India. This is the only scientific and logical solution providing permanent peace between Hindus and Muslims. All the protestations of the Hindus against this idea of the division of India are nothing but of the nature of, what psychologists term 'reaction-formation', that is, the subconscious mind having a strong 'repressed' emotion of fear of losing his caste, etc., due to the presence of the Muslim, wants to conceal that fear by putting up an appearance of over-bold behaviour and trying to show that it is not afraid of them and is against the idea of their separation. It would hurt its vanity to admit even to itself that it is afraid of them. But from the purely scientific and psychological point of view, the Hindu's lifelong desire which is 'repressed' in his subconscious mind can only be fulfilled in this way, so that he may eat, drink and enjoy life anywhere and everywhere in his state without being troubled by a constant subconscious fear of losing his caste and religion and become a victim of the wrath of his Gods, and he can heave a sigh of relief and feel happy. Then and then only can the Muslim be safe from oppressions and persecutions.

Way to India's Salvation

A leading article in the "Assam Herald" 13th April 1940

There is a regular campaign of deliberate misrepresentation by the Hindus and a few Muslim dupes of theirs about the real and true import and implication of the Muslim League's Policy for the future political development of India. Till the time the League has publicly, unequivocally and in very plain language declared its political goal, the Hindus in one chorus were running it down as a reactionary body without any aim or ideal before it. But now when the goal has been defined in plain terms unlike the Congress's goal of nebulous Purna Swaraj, which momentous decision has filled the hearts of 90 million Muslims with unbounded joy and gratitude to Mr Jinnah for the bold lead he has given them to relieve themselves from the perpetual nightmare of the sure prospect of living forever in subjugation of the Hindu majority in India, the same set of designing people in the cloak of so-called nationalism are raising a hue and cry, which only betrays their evil mentality and ulterior motive more than anything had even done before. They have now seen that their nefarious political game is up. The League has, under the guidance of one who is second to none among 400 millions in the country in patriotism but who is head and shoulder above all in facing facts as they are, frustrated their diabolical plan by the resolve it has made not to allow the Hindu majority in India under the guise of Indian nationalism to establish Hindu Raj over the entire subcontinent and keep crushing the 90 million Muslims with the harrow of democracy which would be such handy implement of the Hindu imperialists. The League's goal is to redeem the 90 million Muslims from the position of suppressed, repressed and degenerated community or at best from the position of second-fiddlers in the affairs of the Motherland. The Hindu's one aim now is to misrepresent and misinterpret the League's wise scheme and make it appear as disastrous and ruinous to the country. They pretend not to know that their way leads to sure rack and ruin of India and that the League's way is the best possible way to attain real freedom for all in the country in the shortest possible time.

Mr M A Jinnah the saviour of Indian Muslims, has appealed to the sensible section of the Hindus, who are not still imbued with the

idea of establishing Hindu Raj in India to give serious and earnest consideration to the League's Policy wherein they will find the sure salvation of India. The League has suggested nothing impossible, but the only possible way left open for India to proceed on after 400 years practical experience of the actual state of affairs in this common Motherland of both the Hindus and Muslims. The League's plan is to establish autonomous and sovereign Muslim and Hindu States in areas where they respectively form the majority. The plan provides adequate effective and mandatory safeguards for all minorities statutorily to be embodied in the constitutions of the proposed States. The League's scheme gives the Hindus in their own States and in the Muslim States the same rights and privileges which the Muslims want to have in their States and in the Hindu States. If ever India as a whole is to enjoy freedom and have salvation from foreign domination the League's scheme provides the only solution of this ever baffling problem. The freedom thus obtained by India will mean freedom for all and will be lasting and peaceful. The Congress plan and the British scheme for India's future are fraught with perpetual trouble in the land. All concerned in the future of India must realise that the Muslims are determined to have their legitimate share in the governance of the common country and are determined also to shape their future destiny according to their own ideals.

From the point of view of the Britishers, there is nothing in the League's plan which is unfeasible. Cannot two dominions in India become members of the British commonwealth of Nations? Will not such two dominions as suggested by the League in this inharmonious vast sub-continent be more useful partners of the commonwealth of Nations than one Indian dominion perpetually in internal trouble? From the point of view of the Hindus also there is nothing but good for the people as well as the country inherent in the League's scheme. Do the Hindus, in spite of their numerical preponderance, think that they will be able to rule India peacefully by the means of democratic government? Have they not seen enough that neither they nor the Muslims can become religiously non-descript somebodies for political purposes? Will they not learn from the lessons of experience anything? Was it not Mr Jinnah himself, who from years and years in his political career tried to make people eschew religion from politics? Are not the Hindus responsible for compelling him and many others to revise their political notions? Who in the world can deny that the Muslim attitude in India is entirely defensive which the Hindu aggressive attitude has made them adopt.

There is no question of exchange of population involved as such in the scheme of the League. The question is whether 90 million Muslims are to be a perpetual minority subjugated by a Hindu majority Raj or whether, at least 60 millions of them residing in areas where they form majority should have an opportunity to develop their spiritual, cultural, economic and political life in accordance with their own genius and shape their own future destiny? It is for the realisation of this very important fact that the Muslim minorities in Hindu India readily agreed to the League proposal, when the two dominions will begin to function. Of course there may be a slow movement of population from one dominion to the other which ultimately will be for the good of both.

Mr Gandhi has again aired some of his sentimental views in the columns of 'Harijan' about Hindu-Muslim unity. We have had enough of such sanctimonious humbug and it has not and will complicate more and more the solution of India's political problem. If India's agony is to be shortened, the political problem must be solved in a bold and practical way. Mr Gandhi must know by now that his beguiling words will not shape India's future nor will they ever entrap the 90 million Muslims in perpetual serfdom. The Muslims have already made their final decision and no amount of political sophistry even by a master of cunningness and wiliness like Mr Gandhi, will make them go back on their decision. They are convinced that in their decision lies the salvation of 400 million human beings and the peace and tranquillity in a sub-continent of India's vastness. The Muslims do not want to be told today by Mr Gandhi that the vast majority of them in India are converts to Islam or are decendants of converts. All the world over, they are, one and all, either decendants of converts or are converts to Islam. So are all the Christians, Jews, Budhists and for that matter, even so are all Hindus. God when He created mankind did not give them one religion. He only gave them intelligence and reason. Everyone who belongs to one faith or another is a convert to that faith.

Mr Gandhi admits that Mr Jinnah has raised a fundamental issue in the decision of the League and quotes Mr Jinnah's cogent reasons in extenso for his coming to that decision, but leaves it by saying that it is a baffling problem. He suggests no other solution of the vital problem before the country, but expresses, as has been his wont his pious wish that Hindu-Muslim unity is a very desirable necessity for India's political future. It has been his life's mission, but the world is now convinced that it will end in not fulfilling it. Mr. Jinnah is not

a shallow sentimentalist. He is a sound and deep statesman, so he does not float about in the surface of things in the vain hope of some divine call to prompt him to action, but goes to the very bottom of the problem and seeks its solutions in a thoroughly practical way. He does not wait for human nature to change. Therefore, it may be a trifle baffling for impractical Mr Gandhi to understand practical Mr Jinnah, but India cannot go on allowing her vitals to be eaten to the very end by the deadly canker of communal disharmony, because Mr Gandhi's pious wishes alone will not cure the dying patient. How cunning and how wily this proud Hindu Mahatma is? He has the audacity to interpret the true message of Islam and warn 90 million Muslims not to carve their own path in their own Islamic way for their future progress and prosperity. He must know that 90 million Muslims cannot wait in the pious hope of the Hindu Mahatma someday receiving the inner call for the fulfilment of his life's pious mission.

In conclusion, we would urge all Muslims to explain to all and sundry the true import and implication of the League's policy in order to counteract the nefarious propaganda carried on by the Congress and the Hindu Press against the League's scheme. The mission of the League is honest and straightforward and based on truth and actualities of the situation and it is bound to appeal to all who have India's good in their hearts.

Concept of a Separate Muslim State

By K S Abdur Rahman Khan, M.L.A., Berar,
in The 'Eastern Times', April 26, 1940

Mad fury, unbridled passions, sarcasm and ridicule, and veiled and open threats characterise the criticism levelled against the decision of the Muslim League taken at Lahore. There is again the same deplorable tendency to ignore realities and shut out reason and fairplay from the realm of appreciation of the position and aspirations of the Muslims. It is their first reaction. Let us hope the second one will be more sober and the result of mature and cool consideration. But let the critics remember that though hard words may not break bones they do break hearts beyond the possibility of repairs and amends.

After the long period of suspense and speculation when everybody asked what the league demanded it has come out with a concrete, definite and most reasonable scheme and placed its card on the table. The Congress goal of complete independence, on the other hand, is still a dream of the Shegaon mystic who alone in his inscrutable way can discern the substance from shadow and none knows what this complete independence means.

The Prelude

In spite of our long association of past one thousand years with India our countrymen still suffer from a lack of appreciation of our history, and traditions our psychology the structure and the fabric of our society and our beliefs and aspirations. At times it appears that we are being deliberately misunderstood and misrepresented. For the last century and a half, the Imperial Power and the Hindus seem to have conspired to bring about annihilation of the Muslims in India and be the co-parceners in the exploits. It was a joint and co-operative concern with both and the advantages were reciprocal. Even the last vestiges of Muslim power, culture and influence were destroyed for one or the other reason and the Hindu never failed to offer voluntary services to fill up the gap. The relief of a change of masters was no small gain to them. The Muslims who were the rulers of the land a century and a half ago are no better than paupers today.

Nationalism Born of Hatred

¹ The Muslims never treated India as a land for exploitation and richly contributed to its wealth, progress and prosperity. India was "Heaven on Earth". But since the advent of British rule in India, they came to be treated as aliens and their rule of centuries is considered to have been a reign of terror, of bloodshed, of cow-slaughter, of destruction of temples, of forced conversion and of loot and plunder of the country. The country is portrayed to have been ruled by Timur, the tyrant, Alauddin, the debauchee, Tughlak, the mad, Babar, the drunkard, Humayoon, the opium-taker, Jahangir, the pleasure-lover, Akbar the infidel, Shahjahan, the murderer of his own kith and kin, and Aurangzeb the terror of Hindus. This is the compliment paid to us for our services to India and Indians which are unparalleled in the annals of the country.

India of pre-British days knew no communal problem and history cannot provide us with a single instance when wars were waged on communal or religious basis during the time when the Muslims ruled India. But Nationalism entered through the door of communal hatred in India and was nourished with the sentiments of ill-will and revenge towards the Muslims.

Nationalism in India is a borrowed ideology from the West. A plant of the Frigid Zone is trying to spread roots and branches on the hard rock of the Tropics. It is the Eighth Wonder of the World. No wonder the plant did not prosper and yielded no fruits. On the other hand, it threatens to ruin both the grafts and the main tree. This cross-breed child of Nationalism is the adopted son of British Imperialism and is now trying to oust the legitimate heirs from their rightful possessions.

Hollowness of Theory of Nationalism

Nationalism is the intellectual luxury of the Hindu intelligentsia. It is not the result of natural evolution nor the product of genuine local germination. Nationalism presupposes a Nation, a people, a country, common history, traditions and beliefs, common interests and aspirations. It is based on the fundamental principles of human equality, liberty and citizenship. Apart from Muslims, do the various sections of Hindus satisfy the requirements of Nationhood? India never thought in terms of nationalism during pre-British days. It was never a country and even today it is not a country. The Arya-varta did not extend beyond the boundaries of the Punjab, the Land of five Rivers and the home of the

Vedas Bharat-varsha never crossed the barriers of the Vindhias. Magadha Desha was not India. During the Muslim period, it was divided into Ind, Sind and Dakhan. And what is India? Is it a country? No. It is a sub-continent. Is India a nation? It is a congeries of nations. What is common between the Punjab and Bengal, Rajputana and Maharashtra, Dravid-Desha and Arya-varta, Indian States, and British India, Hindus and Muslims except the common administrative link of the British Government? India is not the name of a country or a nation but of the territory under British Rule, another name for British military occupation. One-third of the territory viz Indian India, does not subscribe to Indian nationalism and the rest is divided even under the Government of India Act of 1935 into autonomous provinces.

Indian nationalism is thus without its basic foundation of universal, social, religious, political and economical equality and liberty. The greatest barrier to the achievement of the cherished goal of nationalism is the structure of Hindu society which has created permanent and graded zones of superiority and inferiority. No Hindu is born an equal of other Hindus nor has he any chance in his life to attain the status of majority.

The Congress which demands the democratising of 600 States and asks the Muslims to merge their identity in the Indian Nationalism should first set its own house in order and dissolve Hindu Society to make India safe for democracy. Without this, Nationalism means only Brahmin Theocracy and Swaraj, Brahmin-cum-Bania Raj.

Growth and Development of Congress Nationalism

Like Nationalism, the very word "Congress" is a foreign nomenclature. The Congress began by petitions and reaffirming its allegiance to the British Crown from year to year. It started from a share in the services under the Crown to a share in local self-government. The next step was self-government interpreted, as responsible government. It was followed by agitation for Home Rule meaning thereby Dominion Status. It was in 1920 that Dominion Status was replaced by Swaraj. Till now, it was a plain political fight against foreign domination. But with the introduction of the mystical ideal of Swaraj and with the advent of diarchy, the seeds of communal misgivings were sown. Swaraj again came down to the level of Dominion Status in the Nehru Report and although the Congress made a high flight in the plain of

complete independence, the impression that the Congress was out for Hindu Raj could not be removed from the Muslim mind. The introduction of provincial autonomy and the idea of a Federal Government have brought the issue to the surface and the Congress is making its last efforts for capturing the centre to install Hindu majority into power.

Since the advent of British rule in India, Muslims are being driven from every position of vantage. When they laid down the reins of power, they were not so low in the scale of nations as they are today. They lost their high place in the services. The Babu replaced the Muslims. The Indianisation of services cost them too much, in the sense that not only their proportion in services was brought down but their language, culture, law and rules of administration, were also given the go-by. Their Jagirs, Inams and religious endowments were ruined. Their arts and crafts ceased to exist. The National Congress had not the charity to shed a tear in sympathy on the fate of Muslims who were the custodians of the national wealth. The Congress grew under the patronising care of the British Imperialism and what was taken out from the hands of the Muslims was given to the 2% Brahmins in the name of Indian Nationalism.

Sir Syed's Message

God bless Sir Syed who came as a messenger of hope for the ill-fated Muslims. The Britishers had treated them as enemies and the Hindus nourished revengeful attitude towards them. Both conjointly forged a literature which created an inferior and criminal feeling in the Muslims. The situation in Europe and the middle East also required this attitude to be strengthened in India. What was left for Muslims to fall back upon in India? They had lost their 8 century rule. They were disarmed. The instinct of self-preservation brought them together and the Aligarh Movement created 'self-consciousness' in them. Otherwise they would have been reckoned as a "Lost Caravan". They organised for the safeguard of their culture, religion, language and above all their individuality as a political entity.

When India was granted that first instalment of reforms, they only asked for their recognition as a distinct nationality and demanded separate electorate. This principle was further accepted by all parties at Lucknow especially the Congress. The Muslims had to pay the greatest price for their recognition as a nation. They gained weightage

in some provinces without any material gain but gave up the right of the majority rule in Bengal and Punjab. Diarchy revealed that democracy in India cannot be saved from the evil influence of communalism and is transferred not to any political party but to a religious group.

During the following revision, the Muslims formulated their 14 demands, having despaired of the Congress to produce a commonly agreed constitution for India. Is there any single Muslim who attended the Round Table Conference who opposed the demand for the attainment of India to the full status of Independence? But the Congress severely opposed all the demands of the Muslims. Although the Nehru Report was drawn in the Ravi, it still haunted the brains of Congressmen. Whatever the Muslims got by way of majority provinces, reforms to the Frontier Province, separation of Sind, separate electorates, is all due to the efforts of the Muslim League, despite the opposition of Congress. At the same time the League is an equal partner in the struggle for India's freedom. The goal of the League is not selfish. It is full independence for India, and not independence for Hindus and dependence and slavery for the rest. The Congress built their house on the ruins of the Muslims. It based its nationalism on the hatred of Muslims, trained it in the nursery of British Imperialism and always captured all points of vantage for the Hindus in the name of Nationalism. The Muslim League always fought for India's freedom and freedom for all.

Communal Role of Congress Democracy

Diarchy was less harmful so far as the communal question is concerned than the provincial autonomy of 1935. The presence of the third party had always kept the majority in its senses. But as soon as elections under provincial autonomy were over, a cry was raised that there were only two parties in India, the British Government and the Congress. The slogan completely eliminated the Muslims from the political field and expunged them from the map of India. As a matter of fact, so far as the working of the provincial constitution was concerned there were really two parties—the Muslims and the Hindus. The advantage gained at Lucknow during 1916 did not lose its grip from the minds of the Congress. They still thought that Muslims as a whole were a minority in India. This was not a fact, The Government of India said that while Muslims were a minority in some provinces, the Hindus were

also a minority in some. The concessions and safeguards to minorities were reciprocal and not one-sided. The Muslim League always willingly acceded to Hindu minority in Muslim-majority provinces what it demanded for the Muslims in other parts of India. But it is the ideology of the Congress which takes its stand on the permanent Hindu majority basis. The Congress, in any scheme of constitution for India, has never given up the idea that Hindus should remain in majority and rule India. Why should the Muslims alone be treated as minority and not the Hindus? According to the Congress phraseology, minority and Muslims have become synonymous. Why not call Hindus a minority because they are a minority in the N W F P, Baluchistan, Sind, the Punjab, Bengal and Kashmir? The Congress by constantly treating the Muslims as a minority, has admitted the fact that India is not a nation. The Congress forgets that the Muslims alone are not the recipient of concessions, safeguards, protections and guarantees. They are granted to the Hindu minority also in the same proportion and rather in a more effective and real way in Muslim zones.

Muslims Under Congress Raj

The fact that by India the Congress contemplates only Hindu India, by nation it means only the Hindu nation and by democracy, it desires the rule of the Hindu majority was demonstrably and conclusively proved during two and a half years' rule of the Congress in 7 provinces. At the very outset the Muslims were discounted as a force to be reckoned in Indian politics. The four-anna membership rule was applied to ensure the complete dominance of Hindu majority. The advent of Hindu Raj was heralded by demonstrations, by hoisting the Congress flag by singing 'Bande Mataram' and propagating the myth that only the Congress organisation, the Congress party and Congress ideals had a right to live. Others should accept the life of subordination, neglect and shame or commit suicide. It may have carried some reason with it, had it been a fight against British Imperialism and people had been asked to offer sacrifices. But where it was the question of working the constitution, actual administration and showing one's worth for self-rule, the Congress not only proved itself to be a communal body, but a tyrant, a despot and an autocrat. It opened the doors of the Congress wide open to Hindus to consolidate their position and sold the power, position, jobs and positions of vantage to Hindus in return for four-anna membership. The swelling of the Congress rolls during recent years

is not due to the conversion of the people to the Congress cult or the popularity of the Congress ideals but mainly to the lust for power. The Congress embarked on a programme deliberately setting it in a form which would have an intense appeal to the Hindu psychology, and would hold out for the Hindus an immense opportunity for a Hindu renaissance. The worship of the Congress flag and Mr Gandhi's image, the Puja of Sarasvatī, the installation of the images of Durga and Sarasvatī in Schools, the Art of Congress leaders, the organisation of village uplift and village industries, the deification of the Charkha, the spread of Sanskritised Hindi, the introduction of the Wardha and Vidya Mandir schemes, the official recognition of the title of "Mahatma" for Mr Gandhi and the declaration of the Gandhi Jayanti and the Tilak Anniversary as State holidays are a few items of the national programme of the Congress.

Then look to the philosophy which guides all this programme. The Gandhi cult was adopted as a State religion. The educational schemes were based on it. The Charkha, Ahimsa, Bhajnavali, Satyagraha, Upasana, silence-day, Brahmacharya and Harijan Uddhar became the basic principles of this new religion and the political movement in India. Gandhi means Congress and his cult means the Congress programme. The two are inseparable from each other.

Persecution of Muslims

This cult was enforced not by non-violent means but by the use of all available brute force: the application of Bengal Regulations, resort to firing, intimidation and coercion not excluding Hindu activities got State patronage while Muslims suffered that fate of a neglected minority.

But neglect is a lesser crime than deliberate persecution, oppression and suppression. The history of the atrocities committed on Muslims in Congress provinces is simply heart-rending and can only be compared to that of the post-Mutiny days, and even worse. The Britishers were foreigners but the Congress claims to be national. Everybody felt an inner urge to revert to the pre-Reform days rather than be the partners in provincial autonomy. What is the good of the Swaraj which was inaugurated and worked out with the aid of British bayonets? The Congress would have been true to itself had it dispensed with the protecting arm of the British and raised its Empire on the good-will and willing co-operation of the people. On the other hand the

Congress assumed autocratic and dictatorial airs and treated the opposition with contempt and revengeful sentiments. The Congress followed in the footsteps of Hitlerism by erecting its Swaraj on the ruins of the so-called minorities. Congress rule has proved a nightmare and one is wondering whether it was the influence of a Saint or a Satan.

Is India One Nation ?

By Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad, M A Muslim University, Aligarh

Giving his impressions of the working of provincial autonomy in India gained during his recent tour of the country Lt-Col Muirhead, Under-Secretary of State for India, made some significant remarks which call for more than a passing attention. Lt Col Muirhead has tried to understand the play of the forces let loose by the introduction of the New Constitution and the nature of the conflict which is becoming more and more marked all over the country. But we are afraid he has slipped into same erroneous impression which any foreign observer not conversant with the under-currents of the body politic of this country is apt to gather. It has come to the notice of the Under-Secretary of State for India that the tendency on the part of both those in power and those in opposition was to consider that what the position now, is, would be the position always. He further deplores our failure to appreciate an essential feature of democratic Government—namely, the majority and minority parties are never permanent the change of chances bring fluctuation in the fortunes of parties often unexpectedly and in a short space of time. Hence he proceeds to conclude that any party's opposition to Federation from the apprehension that it would, at the outset, put power into the hands of somebody other than itself is untenable. Of course, if the first thesis of the Under-Secretary of State about the formation of parties were true of Indian conditions then no one could seriously entertain the argument that the Federal scheme as embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935 should not be introduced merely because it would instal in power some party other than one's own. The hint is clearly towards the Muslims, for it is they who feel that the establishment of this particular type of Federation would perpetuate the rule of a permanent communal Hindu majority at the centre which would even nullify whatever little power the Muslims wield in a few provinces. But one may well ask, is the proposition propounded by Lt-Col Muirhead really as simple as it appears to be? A slight inkling into the answer is to be found in his own words when he proceeds to remark that the opinion most strongly expressed throughout the length and breadth of India was the antagonism between the Hindus and Muslims—an antagonism, which, I am led to believe, is much on the increase. This

antagonism seemed to go far beyond the grounds of mere religious feelings "

Let us see what after all is the main concept on which the democratic parliamentary system of Government is based. It is postulated on the idea of a single homogenous and compact nationality. Does this preliminary condition obtain in India? Even a casual observer can see for himself that the existence of a single nationality in India is a wish, a presumption at best a figure of speech but not a fact. Hence the difficulty in reconciling the facts on the ground of the false presumption. An Englishman speaking from his experience of the working of democracy in his own country and in other democratic countries of the West is bewildered to find why there should be such bitter and ruthless conflict between those in office and those in opposition. In other democratic countries, he finds that the fluctuation of majority into minority and vice versa is a thing of common occurrence. It is a game of chance, of skill, of strategy. Why then he very naturally asks the question, should the oppositions in India be obsessed by the fact that they were in opposition and the other party was in power. It is because he has perhaps not been able to look beneath the surface and grasp the fact that the line of cleavage in this country is the presence of two distinct and mutually exclusive nationalities—the one eternally homogenous but lacking effective organisation the other loose and ponderous but fast becoming organized and acquiring some sort of a self-consciousness.

The formation of parties also proceeds on the ground of this vital difference of nationalities—the Hindu and the Muslim—no matter what the labels of the parties may be, for the majority can always afford to assume a non-communal label. The parties are not based on mere religious differences as some are apt to imagine. It is a deeper conflict—a clash of two separate national entities one striving to dominate and if possible to absorb the other and the other struggling to save itself from annihilation to maintain itself intact. In the German Press it was recently stated that the trouble in India was really a Kultur Kampf—a cultural struggle, one culture was struggling to acquire supremacy over the other. It is really surprising that what the Englishman is not able to perceive despite his long association with India the German is quick to detect with his penetrating insight even from a distance. On the assumption that India is one nation, the situation as it stands really becomes inexplicable. Take India as two fundamentally different nations and the situation becomes obvious and the problem, easy of solution.

The question now is why this tendency on the part of both those in office and those in opposition to assume that they would always remain in the same position. The answer is not far to seek. The party in power is a different nation and has the ambition to dominate the other nation of 90 million people. These 90 million people—the Muslims—are not concentrated in one locality or region, for then the problem would not have bristled with such difficulties. They are scattered far and wide all over the country, such that in seven provinces they are small minorities, in two they are slightly in majority and in two they hold substantial majorities. This being the case, it would be a misnomer to call the Muslims a minority in the sense in which the term is used in modern political parlance. Are the Muslims then a separate Nation?

The 90 million Muslims, through their authoritative and representative organisation, the All-India Muslim League, form the main block of opposition in the various provinces ruled by ministries which owe allegiance to an avowedly Hindu body—the Congress party. It is needless to recapitulate how the Congress party which is dominated by a Brahmin oligarchy in the flush of power declared war on the Muslim League the moment it was assured of majorities in the various provincial Legislatures and refused to co-operate with the Muslim League party on any terms. The Congress with all its power and pelf launched upon a special campaign of Muslim Mass Contact, which, had it not been thwarted in time by the Muslim League, would have meant the virtual extinction of the Muslims as a political and cultural entity in the country. But that contingency has been largely averted and the Muslims today are engaged in a desperate struggle for self-preservation. The Muslims have always fought for the separate electorate. The natural corollary of separate electorate for Muslims is, that only a Muslim body has the right to seek the suffrage of Muslims and claim the right, if it receives the mandate of the Muslim nationality to represent it in the legislature, in the cabinet, in fact in all representative institutions established under the constitution. But this principle was completely ignored by the party in power, which as over a year's experience has shown, is exclusively Hindu in spirit and action. Any individual Muslim who was prepared to betray his party overnight and sign the Congress pledge was appointed and passed off as a Muslim minister or a Muslim parliamentary secretary and, of course, as a patriot and a nationalist. It is a sad reflection on British policy that even provincial Governors have been party to this flagrant violation of the letter and spirit of the constitution and the

instrument of instructions in so far as the protection of the legitimate rights of the Muslims are concerned. This state of affairs coupled with the aggressively anti-Muslim attitude of the Congress Ministries as disclosed by most of their measures and policies alarmed the Muslims and awakened in them the consciousness of the deep gulf of national cleavage, which in spite of all their efforts to patch it up, separated them from the Hindu majority.

The Muslims who ruled this country for not less than eight hundred years, realize that they have all the requisite characteristics of a Nation, a nation fundamentally different from all other nations. They cannot willingly sacrifice their separate nationality at the altar of Hindu nationalism. Their idea of nationality is not based on identity of race or community of economic interest or attachment to the geographical boundaries of a particular territory; it rests on a definite life-outlook and a social polity. Islam is not a mere religion among religions; a scheme of salvation in the life hereafter or a matter of private relationship between the individual and his God. Islam is a social polity and a state-idea whose purposes cannot be fulfilled except through a corporate and well-ordered society. It is on this basis that the Muslims take their stand as a distinct political and social unit. They are deeply conscious of their separate cultural characteristics which have developed from their adherence to an all-embracing creed and certain moral principles governing all aspects of life. It is this separate cultural characteristics which entitle them to claim for themselves the status of a separate nationality. They claim no more for themselves than the right of self-determination as a separate nationality. It is a truism that no nationality can exist as a distinct cultural entity unless it is possessed of political power. Politics is power. This has been proved not once but several times since the Great War and the Treaty of Versailles. Goodwill, love, and toleration can only be demonstrated when a party has come into power. How attempts are made to annihilate a minority by subtle methods under the garb of democracy in spite of all constitutional guarantees, is instanced by Czechoslovakia; the Sudeten-Germans would certainly have been swept away if it had not been for the strong backing of a great power like Germany.

In India the Muslims and Hindus, with their historical traditions and their future aspirations, are two different nationalities. The most scientific view of nationality is that *a People, when it develops, out of the consciousness of a Historical past and a future destiny, the will to form*

a state becomes a nation All the elements which comprise the historical and cultural traditions and the future aspirations of a nation are entirely different from each other in the case of the Muslims and Hindus Each of them has a different world view and a different attitude towards life The Muslim's outlook on life is determined exclusively by his religion which embraces all aspects of life while the Hindu outlook on life is shaped by certain discreet ideas which are absolutely incompatible with Islamic principles To the Muslim this world is a unity and his role in this world is self affirmation and self assertion with a view to establishing the supremacy of moral values derived from the oneness and greatness of God the Hindu looks upon this world as Maya illusion and to his mind the highest form of life is either insensate hoarding of material goods or complete self abnegation Since there is want of belief in future destiny for the self they devote themselves entirely to acquiring and coveting worldly goods and possessions believing that this world is all in all or in the alternative they renounce the world altogether believing that it is Maya or illusion Besides the religious beliefs the sacred personalities and the religious personalities which the Muslims and Hindus revere are all different Their conception of morality and moral laws are opposed to each other The Muslim conception of morality is based on the fundamental idea of responsibility for all actions The idea of necessity inherent in Hindu thought leaves no place for virtue because the present life is necessarily determined by the previous existence according to law of Karma Their legal systems and personal laws have nothing in common with each other special marriage divorce and inheritance laws The Muslim law permits widow remarriage the Hindu law prohibits it The Muslim divorce law takes into consideration human weakness the Hindu law does not allow divorce under any circumstances Under Muslim law all descendants wife son daughter and others get equitable shares under the Hindu law the eldest son alone inherits to the exclusion of all others The most marked diversity between the Muslims and Hindus is to be seen in their social systems The Hindu society is based on the rigid system of Varnashram the four main castes with thousands of sub castes The castes are rigid and immutable and even in this twentieth century of enlightenment and progress the world sees the strange sight of eight crores of people the original inhabitants of this country branded as untouchables and condemned to a life of perpetual serfdom and treated worse than animals The Muslims form a fraternity irrespective of family wealth or rank Their sentiments of brotherhood the like of which the world has yet to find

springs from their belief in one God one Prophet one Book of Guidance in all aspects of life. The modern man of the West would be astonished to hear that men of different castes in the Hindu society cannot even eat together at the same table leave alone the Muslims who are looked upon as Mlechas impure. The exclusive and separatist attitude of Hindus prevents any social intercourse between the Muslims and Hindus developing. Similarly the Muslims and Hindus follow entirely different scales of values. The sense of values is directly traceable to their respective world views. The Muslim values money only in so far as it subserves the material needs of life which are always subjects to moral ends. To the Hindu the acquiring and hoarding of money is the main value in life. The Hindu regards the cow as sacred and worships it as a deity. They also use cow dung and urine as sacred materials for purposes of purification. They insist on cow-protection even at the sacrifice of human lives and spend vast sums of money over it. The Muslims value the cow only as a means in the service of human comfort. The question of cow protection often leads to riots. This difference in the sense of values is noticeable in all aspects of life.

The chief argument for the Western brand of nationalism is that economic questions know no distinction of Muslim and Hindu. This is again a superficial and false view to take. The economic principles and even economic needs and interests of Muslims and Hindus are different. The various trades professions callings and services have become divided on the lines of Muslims and Hindus and even among Hindus there are such divisions on the basis of castes and sub castes. The requirements of Muslims in respect of housing food clothing ceremonies religious rites modes of living and entertainment social and personal obligations are distinct from those of the Hindus. The large majority of Muslims consists of peasants labourers petty traders or men in services and some liberal professions. Muslims are heavily in debt. The Hindus command all positions of power and self trade commerce industry and high posts. They are also bankers and moneylenders. Naturally the economic interests of Hindus and Muslims conflict at every point. The idea of human equality is foreign to the Hindu Mind. Not only does the difference of caste tend to deny the equality of man but the Hindu joint family system and law of inheritance promote inequalities and capitalism. For example when a Hindu dies his eldest son inherits the whole property and rest of the family receive bare maintenance allowance and are compelled to live together as one family. The Muslim law of inheritance is based on the principle of Islamic brother hood and consequently every

member of the family is able to lend a self-respecting existence. Accumulation of wealth in a single hand is made impossible. As regards economic principles, Islam strictly prohibits hoarding and giving and taking interest, hoarding monopoly, speculation, cornering and all other money-grabbing tactics which lead to capitalism, the pelf and luxury of a few and the misery of vast numbers of the common people, the Hindu society takes no exception to these practices. In fact all the economic bourses, the bloated usurers, industrial magnates and capitalists in the country are all Hindus. Thus there is a definite breach in the economic interests and principles of Hindus and Muslims.

History plays a very important part in the growth of nations. It is from their historical past and their illustrious forbears that nations derive inspiration for building up a great future. The Muslims have a different historical heritage, different heroes and different memories of defeats and victories from the Hindus. Already the Hindus have begun to revive and idolise the memory of those very personages in Indian history who were notorious for their hatred and enmity towards Muslims, for instance Shivaji and Rana Pratap.

Another controversial question which has come to the fore is the language problem. Till a few years ago, Urdu was considered the common language of different nationalities of the country. Urdu came into existence as a result of the mutual intercourse of Muslims and Hindus and the interaction of different languages, Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit and Turkish in the days of Moghul kings. At one time, Hindus also cooperated in promoting the growth of Urdu language and literature. The Muslims would fain share the Urdu language with the Hindus. But ever since the reorientation in the political policy of the Hindus leading to the designs of Hindu Raj, Urdu has been given the go-by and attempts are being made to force Sanskritized Hindi, which most Hindus themselves do not understand in the whole country. Sometimes the term Hindustani is used to conceal the real intention of propagating Hindi. Sometime back, attempts were made to change the name of Urdu itself into Hindustani, so that the next step of obliterating Urdu altogether and installing Hindi in its place may become easier. But the Muslims saw through the ruse, and resisted the attempt. The Congress leaders, specially Mr. Gandhi, the real moving spirit of the Congress, make no secret of their avowed intention to make Sanskritized Hindi the language of the country. It is quite in keeping with the dreams of Hindu Raj.

Therefore the Muslims naturally apprehend that the eclipse of Urdu would mean a great blow to their separate national identity. For, language is a powerful factor in the building up of a nationality, it is the real repository of a people's historical heritage, traditions and contribution to world civilization, it is the mirror of a people's mind, its thought, its culture and aspirations. Thus the question of protection of Urdu has become part of the Muslim national problem.

Intimately allied with the question of language is the educational problem. Before the advent of provincial autonomy, the educational policy was entirely in the hands of the British. That policy closely followed the lines laid down by Lord Macaulay—namely the Indians should be given English education in such a way that in course of time a generation of Indians may grow up which though Indian in colour and race would be thoroughly Westernised in thought and outlook and would serve to carry on the British administrative machinery. The policy did succeed to a great extent. But since the passing of a limited amount of power into the hands of the Hindu majority, attempts are being made to remould the educational system, particularly in the primary stages to subserve the central aim of Hindu Raj. To that end, a scheme of primary education known as the Wardha scheme of education, has been evolved under the guiding genius of Mr Gandhi. The scheme has a definite political motive behind it—namely the obliteration of Muslim culture by subtle methods and preparation of a generation which will cease to be Muslim in thought, character and action. The scheme is based on two basic ideas—the doctrine of ahimsa (non-defence) and the ideal of territorial nationalism. Both cut at the root of the fundamental beliefs of the Muslims. They reject the doctrine of ahimsa (non-defence) for their religion enjoins on them the duty to fight in the cause of righteousness and against evil when and wherever necessary. The insistence on the doctrine of ahimsa is only meant to root out from the Muslim youths their martial spirit and traditions. Even the question of food is taken into consideration, the scheme contemplates making common food which means vegetarian food compulsory for all children. Muslims are a virile race being meat-eaters, it is sought to rob them of their virility by addicting their younger generation to vegetarian food. Similarly the principle of territorial nationalism militates against the Muslim view of nationalism which is based on a philosophy of society and outlook on life rather than allegiance to a territorial boundary. The emphasis laid on nationalism in the scheme

is calculated to destroy the distinctive identity of Muslims and to merge them into the nationalism of the Hindu majority. The whole trend of the scheme is to impress on the mind of the Muslim child the inferiority and impotence of Muslim culture and to establish the revival and supremacy of the primitive Hindu culture of Vedic times. The Muslim children would be taught to believe that all religions are equally true and to study the life of their Holy Prophet only in the setting and background of Arabia so that they may cease to hold the cardinal Islamic belief that Islam is the final truth and their Prophet is a Universal Teacher and then the process of the merger of Muslims in the Hindu fold may be facilitated. The Wardha Scheme is a stroke of Mr Gandhi's genius. What the Congress as a political organisation could not do openly namely merge the Muslims into Hindu nationalism the Wardha Scheme of Education may achieve by slow but sure methods. This is another instance of the fundamental clash of national ideals between Muslims and Hindus.

The coming into power of Congress ministries has also signalled an alarming increase in the number of Muslim Hindu riots and an accentuation of bitter feelings between Muslims and Hindus in the Congress Provinces. The riots are not the manifestation of mere religious differences for such differences have always been there and they exist in non Congress provinces also. It is the oppressive and discriminating policy and the hostile attitude of Congress governments that lead to frequent riots. The outward causes of Muslim Hindu conflicts are music before mosques, the tri colour flag of the Congress, the Bande Mataram song and cow-protection. Music is deliberately played before mosques to injure Muslim religious sentiments. The tri colour flag is forcibly hoisted on public buildings and schools and colleges though the Muslims refuse to acknowledge it as the national flag. The Bande Mataram song is insisted upon as the national song though it is most offensive to Muslim sentiments being anti Muslim in its purport and idolatrous in its inspiration. In some schools Muslim children are forced to sing Bande Mataram and to worship Mr Gandhi's portrait and to dress and salute in the Hindu fashion. The policy of the Congress governments is inspired by the ambition of the Hindu majority to dominate and rule the Muslim minority which refuses to recognize the Hindus as its superiors. The Muslims resent injustice and discriminatory treatment. They refuse to be lulled into the position of an under study of the Hindus and this leads to rioting. How the Muslims are being

subjected to systematic persecution, tyranny and oppression in Congress governed provinces is a long and painful story. In certain parts of the country, unspeakable atrocities have been perpetrated on poor and defenceless Muslims but the Congress governments of the localities took no steps to bring the offenders to book. (A full and graphic account of injustices and tyrannies inflicted on Muslims in Congress governed provinces is to be found in the Pirpur Report published by the All-India Muslim League). In many remote villages, the Muslims live in constant dread of their lives and honour. They dare not perform cow-sacrifice or even call Azan (call to prayer). Civil liberties for which Congressmen used to cry their throats hoarse before they came into office are not meant for Muslims. Their meetings are spied upon, their freedom to hold meetings, to take out processions or perform cow-sacrifice as a religious rite, is often circumscribed by the promulgation of orders under Section 144 Cr P C. The exercise of civil and religious rights by Muslims has been made conditional on 'custom' and 'law and order'. And who is to judge whether 'custom' and the exigencies of 'law and order' allow the exercise of civil and religious rights? It is the Congressmen and their subordinate officials. The morale and prestige of district officials have been impaired, for they have been directed to act in consultation with local Congressmen. The officials therefore cannot act with independence and impartiality. The Congressmen and even Hindu officials are behaving as if Hindu Raj has already been established. Even the dispensation of justice in law-courts is interfered with. There have been many cases recently of Congressmen trying to influence decisions of the law-courts and of Congress ministries overriding the decisions of High Courts. The Urdu press is being gagged, for it is the only press which dares to criticize the Congress governments. Judiciary has not been separated from executive, consequently impartial administration of justice is not assured.

Most departments and services of the government are almost entirely manned and officered by Hindus. Of course, this a legacy of pre-Reform days. But the position has become worse since the assumption of office by the Congress. The demand of Muslims for adequate representation in services and in promotion to higher posts is ignored. Muslims are being gradually squeezed out of key positions. Muslim schools, maktabas and charitable institutions receive no encouragement from Congress Governments. The policy on the other hand is to exterminate them gradually.

Even economic measures are so devised and manipulated as to hit the Muslims financially. Muslims are sedulously excluded from the benefits of social welfare schemes. This is the doing of even the so called socialists. Heavy taxes are levied on such trades as are in the hands of Muslims. The execution of all beneficent schemes is in the hands of Hindu officials who see to it that the Muslims get no share in the benefits. Congressmen feel no scruple of shame in opposing the Tenancy Bill of the Bengal government because most of the landlords, there, are Hindus and the peasants Muslims. But in the U P they insist on an ill-conceived and crooked tenancy law to persecute the landlords no matter whether it would do real good to peasants or not, for the Muslims have some share in land-ownership. In the Punjab, the Congress vehemently opposed the Agrarian Bills and went to the extent of calling them Black Bills for they would benefit the agricultural classes and other people suffering under heavy burden of debts, because the money grasping usurers are Hindus. But in Bihar where Hindu Landlords are strong the Congress readily entered into a compromise with them over the tenancy question. Moreover, the Congress does not move a finger to touch the money-lenders, the middle-men in various trades and the millowners who are the real blood-suckers of the poor masses, for they are all Hindus. While so much anxiety is displayed to promote the interests of the peasants practically nothing is done to improve the lot of the labourers. The reason is obvious. Peasants are far larger in number and it is to their strength and support that the Congress owes its position. The labourers are fewer in number and work under Hindu capitalists. Instances can be multiplied but it would be so irksome. It is clear that there is no uniformity of principle in the Congress policy which is only determined by the consideration of Hindu domination.

It is on the ground of these vital national differences that parties in India have grown up. Circumstanced as they are it is but natural that the Muslims should find themselves in a perpetual minority in the majority of provinces under the democratic parliamentary system of Government. The position would have been a little easier for at least some time if the Hindu majority had taken a large view of the situation and entered into some sort of understanding with the Muslim minority. But all hopes of a rapprochement were dashed to the ground when the Congress representing the Hindus refused to acknowledge the status of the All-India Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Muslims of India. The Congress arrogates to itself

the right to represent the whole of India and denies the existence of anything like a distinct Muslim nationality. Naturally this state of affairs is inconceivable for the British people, for the ideal before them is Nation on a geographical and economic basis. All other values and interests are minor issues as compared with this central idea. The mode of approach to the National Political Ideal is common. Differences arise only with regard to those values which are the private concerns of the individual. These interests are served sometimes by joining or voting for one political party, sometimes by organizing parties on other lines.

What is therefore the solution of the Indian Problem?

Parliamentary democracy as it is being tried in the provinces cannot work with success much less the proposed federation. The present state of unrelenting tension and strife may lead to civil war which it behoves every one of us to avoid as far as we can. The present constitution under which all decisions are made by the counting of noses has placed power into the hands of a communal Hindu Majority which cannot be altered by any constitutional means. Its exclusive and domineering policy is a source of constant irritation and alarm to the minority which feels that under the present order of things which is backed by British power it has no chance of obtaining any share in political power. Without effective political power the Muslims would cease to exist as a separate national and cultural unit. In sheer desperation the Muslims may in course of time be driven to precipitate action which would prove disastrous to all concerned. The only way out of the impasse therefore seems to be to divide India into two federations—federation of Muslim majority provinces and states and another of Hindu majority provinces and states. The relations between the two federations should be regulated by a voluntary treaty of alliance as between two sovereign states. There should also be provision for mutual exchange of population and reciprocal safeguards for the minorities living in each federation. The creation of two such federations is quite feasible and would be in the best interests of both Muslims and Hindus.

It appears that the federal scheme embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935 is again going to be thrown into the melting pot. The situation is pregnant with far-reaching possibilities. The Muslims occupy a strategic position in the fluid and fast changing situation. Is it not time that they came out with a positive demand for a separate Muslim federation?

Viceroy's Statement

Dated the 8th August 1940

"India's anxiety, at this moment of critical importance, in the world struggle against tyranny and aggression, to contribute to the full to the common cause, and to the triumph of our common ideals, is manifest. She has already made a mighty contribution. She is anxious to make a greater contribution still.

"His Majesty's Government are deeply concerned that that unity of national purpose in India which would enable her to do so, should be achieved at as early a moment as possible. They feel that some further statement of their intentions may help to promote that unity. In that hope they have authorised me to make the present statement.

' Last October His Majesty's Government again made it clear that Dominion Status was their objective of India. They added that they were ready to authorise the expansion of the Governor-General's Council to include a certain number of representatives of political parties, and they proposed the establishment of a consultative Committee.

"In order to facilitate harmonious co-operation, it was obvious that some measure of agreement in the provinces, between the major parties, was a desirable pre-requisite to their joint collaboration at the Centre. Such an agreement was unfortunately not reached, and, in the circumstances, no progress was then possible.

"During the earlier part of this year, I continued my efforts to bring the political parties together. In these last few weeks I again entered into conversations with prominent political personages in British India, and the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, the results of which have been reported to His Majesty's Government.

"His Majesty's Government have seen also the resolutions passed by the Congress Working Committee, the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha.

"It is clear that the earlier differences which had prevented the achievement of national unity remain unbridged. Deeply as His

Majesty's Government regret this, they do not feel that they should any longer, because of these differences, postpone the expansion of the Governor-General's Council, and the establishment of a body which will more closely associate Indian public opinion with the conduct of the war by the Central Government

They have authorised me accordingly to invite a certain number of representative Indians to join my Executive Council. They have authorised me further to establish a War Advisory Council which would contain representatives of the Indian states, and of other interests in the national life of India as a whole

"The conversations which have taken place, and the resolutions of the bodies which I have just mentioned make it clear, however, that there is still, in certain quarters doubt as to the intentions of His Majesty's Government for the constitutional future of India, and that there is doubt, too, as to whether the position of the minorities whether political or religious is sufficiently safeguarded in relation to any constitutional change by the assurance already given

'There are two main points which have emerged. On those two points His Majesty's Government now desire me to make their position clear

'The first is as to the position of Minorities in relation to any future constitutional scheme. It has already been made clear that my declaration of last October does not exclude the examination of any part, either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based

"His Majesty's Government's concern that full weight should be given to the views of the minorities in any revision, has also been brought out. That remains the position of His Majesty's Government. It goes without saying that they could not contemplate the transfer of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India, to any system of Government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life

'Nor could they be parties to the coercion of such elements into submission to such a Government

'The second point of general interest is the machinery for building, within the British Commonwealth of Nations, a new constitutional

scheme, when the time comes. There has been very strong insistence that the framing of that scheme should be primarily the responsibility of Indians themselves and should originate from Indian conceptions of the social, economic and political structure of Indian life.

"His Majesty's Government are in sympathy with that desire, and wish to see it given the fullest practical expression, subject to the due fulfilment of the obligations, with Great Britain's long connection with India has imposed upon her and for which His Majesty's Government cannot divest themselves of the responsibility.

'It is clear that a moment when the Commonwealth is engaged in struggle for existence is not one in which fundamental constitutional issues can be decisively resolved but His Majesty's Government authorise me to declare that they will most readily assent to the setting up, after the conclusion of the war, with the least possible delay of a body, representative of the principle elements in India's national life, in order to devise the framework of the new constitution and they will lend every aid in their power to hasten the decision on all relevant matters to the utmost degree.

Meanwhile they will welcome and promote in any way possible, every sincere and practical step that may be taken, by representative Indians themselves, to reach a basis of friendly agreement, firstly on the form which the post-war representative body should take, secondly upon the principles and outlines of the constitution itself.

'They trust, however, that for the period of the war (with the Central Government reconstituted and strengthened in the manner I have described and with the help of the War Advisory Council), all parties, communities and interests will combine and co-operate in making a notable Indian contribution to the victory of the world cause which is at stake.

"Moreover, they hope that in this process, new bonds of union and understanding will emerge and thus pave the way towards the attainment by India of that free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth which remains the proclaimed and accepted goal of the Imperial Crown and of the British Parliament.

Mr. Amery, on India's Political Goal

Reported in India on August, 16, 1940

Mr Amery said "I hope I may claim the indulgence of the House this evening, not only because this is the first time after a long interval of years that I have spoken at this box, but also because of the importance and difficulty of the subject with which I have to deal To keep one's balance steadily along a knife-edge of ice in the high Alps is a much easier task than treading one's way without stumbling or offence through the intricate pitfall-strewn maze of the present Indian situation

"So I trust that members, before they enter upon a discussion of the important statement issued by the Viceroy last week, will bear patiently with me while I endeavour to say something about the background of the political controversy and deadlock which has led up to that statement For, I think it is only in that way that the full significance and purport of Lord Linlithgow's initiative and of the decision of His Majesty's Government in this matter can be rightly understood

"Five years have passed since the passage of the Government of India Act That measure, the fruit of a long series of commission and conferences as well as many stirring debates represented a remarkable effort of constructive statesmanship on the part of this House So far as the provincial part of the Act is concerned, it presently came into operation and is still being worked successfully in four out of the eleven provinces

Difficulties Involved

' If it is temporarily suspended in the other seven, that has not been due to any failure on the part of the provincial ministries to carry out the responsibilities entrusted to them or to any conflict between them and the provincial Governors or the Central Government, but to purely extraneous causes of which I shall have something to say in a moment

"Whether the Central provisions of the Act might have worked equally well if they could have been put into operation promptly, may be

an open question. What is certain is that the delays involved inevitable as they may have been have afforded occasion for the development of a volume of adverse criticism and opposition in the face of which their enforcement could no longer serve the purpose for which they were originally devised. What is however essential to keep in mind is that this opposition comes from different quarters and indeed is based on opposite reasons.

The constitutional deadlock in India is not so much between His Majesty's Government and a consentient Indian opposition as between the main elements in India's own national life. It can therefore only be resolved not by the relatively easy method of a bilateral agreement between His Majesty's Government and representatives of India but by the much more difficult method of a multilateral agreement in which His Majesty's Government is only one of the parties concerned.

There is first of all the Indian National Congress. Its leaders have repudiated the Act of 1935 in its federal aspect as a denial both of India's right to immediate complete independence and of the principles of democracy. It is in pursuance of that repudiation because India's consent was not formally invited before she was committed to war that they called out the Congress ministries in the provinces. Their demand has been that India's independence should be recognised forthwith and that the Indians should devise their own constitution in a constituent assembly elected by universal adult suffrage over all India including territories of the Indian Princes.

In the last few weeks they have declared their willingness in the meantime to join in the war effort through a national government commanding the confidence of the elected Assembly. The Congress leaders are men inspired by an ardent national patriotism. They have built up a remarkable organisation for the most efficient political machine in India of which they are justly proud. They have striven to make that organisation national and all embracing.

If only they had succeeded if the Congress could in fact speak as it professes to speak for all the main elements in India's national life then however advanced their demands our problem would have been in many respects far easier than it is today.

It is true that they are numerically the largest single party in British India. But their claim in virtue of that fact to speak for India

is utterly denied by very important elements in India's complex national life. These other elements assert their right to be regarded, not as mere numerical minorities but as separate constituent factors in any future Indian policy, entitled to be treated as such, in any discussions for the shaping of India's future constitution

Muslims' Position

"The foremost among these elements, stands the great Muslim community, of ninety million strong and constituting a majority both in North-Western and North-Eastern India, but scattered as a minority over the whole sub-continent. In religious and social outlook, in historic tradition and culture, the difference between them and their Hindu fellow-countrymen goes as deep if not deeper, than any similar difference in Europe. That need not and does not, prevent pleasant social intercourse or fruitful political co-operation. It has not, in fact, prevented individual Muslims taking an active part in the work of the Congress Party.

"But, as a body, the Muslims have stood aloof. Their quarrel with the scheme of the existing Act is not that it fails to give that clear majority rule which the Congress asks for, but that it would give too great powers to a Hindu majority at the Centre. They will have nothing to do with a constitution framed by a constituent assembly elected by a majority vote in geographical constituencies. They claim the right in any constitutional discussions to be regarded as an entity and are determined only to accept a constitution whose actual structure will secure their position as an entity against the operations of a mere numerical majority.

"The same, though in a lesser degree perhaps applies to the great body of what are known as the Scheduled Castes who feel, in spite of Mr. Gandhi's earnest endeavours on their behalf, that as a community they stand outside the main body of Hindu community which is represented by the Congress.

Princes' Objections

"The Indian Princes again, with territories covering a third of all India and including nearly a quarter of its population, constitute another entity or group of entities which refuses to be assimilated to the simple democratic formula propounded by the Congress. They object to the existing scheme as interfering too greatly with their existing powers

They naturally object even more strongly to the proposed constituent assembly or to any constitution which might emerge from it. Yet they are an essential element in any Indian federation. What is more they can make a valuable contribution to it.

In many ways their territories are the most characteristically Indian part of India. They have equally much to gain from a closer contact with the rest of India in constitutional as well as economic development but it is idle to suppose that such a development can take place over-night or must be forced upon them before they can be allowed to play their part in a federal scheme.

It is essential to keep these differences in mind when we talk of finding a solution for India's constitutional problems. They are at the moment still unbridged. I refuse to regard them as unbridged. Underlying them there is after all the fact that India is a self-contained and distinctive region of the world. There is the fact India can boast of an ancient civilisation and of a long history common to all its peoples of which all Indians are equally proud. Is there any Indian who is not proud to be called an Indian? Or any Indian or any community who has not felt a thrill of pride to be a fellow countryman of a man like Rabindranath Tagore whom Oxford has just honoured in so unique a manner? Underlying them too is the unity not merely of administration but of political thought and aspiration which we here can justly claim to have contributed to India's national life.

India cannot be unitary in the sense that we are in this island but she can still be a unity. India's future house of freedom has room for many mansions.

In no respect has the essential unity of India's outlook been shown more clearly than in the attitude which all parties and communities have from the outset of the war taken up in detestation of Nazi aggression and in their endorsement of our common cause. The greater our difficulties the graver the disasters that befell the Allied arms the clearer has been the realisation in the minds of the Indian public that our cause is India's cause the stronger the wave of sympathetic emotion for this country in its single handed fight the more wide-spread the feeling that a purely political deadlock affecting the issues of today and tomorrow should not be allowed to stand in the way of India's contributing a united and wholehearted effort to the cause upon whose victory

depends the preservation of all her ideals and the fulfilment of all her aspirations

"It is in this atmosphere that the Viceroy felt that the moment had come for an initiative which should at the same time enlist all elements of political leadership in India behind her war effort, and also make, at any rate, a beginning in breaking down the existing political deadlock and so pave the way towards an early achievement of that goal of free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth which, to quote the concluding words of his statement, is the proclaimed and accepted goal of the Imperial Crown and of the British Parliament

Representative Members

"The immediate offer contained in the Viceroy's statement is that of an expansion of his Executive Council as Governor-General so as to include in it leading members of all political parties as well as the establishment of a wider War Advisory Council on an all-India basis, associating with the conduct of the war representative of the Indian States and of other interests in the national life of India as a whole

"The enlarged Executive Council will, of course, under the existing constitution, still be responsible to the Governor-General and cannot be responsible in the strict constitutional sense to the legislature. The Congress have asked that a provisional national government should be constituted at the Centre, which though formed as a transitory measure should be such as to command the confidence of all elected elements in the Central Legislature

"In inviting a certain number of representative Indians to join his Council, the Viceroy will naturally take appropriate steps to ensure that the new members do in fact reflect opinion of the parties from which they are chosen. If, however, the Congress claim is that the members of the Viceroy's Council should be dependent on the support of elected members of the legislature, it is in fact a demand for changing the whole basis of the Indian Government in the middle of the war

Whole Issue Raised Again

'More than that, if the House has followed the analysis I have attempted to give of the attitude of the different elements in India to the constitutional problem, it will realise that.

"It is a demand which really raised the whole unresolved constitutional issue and pre-judges it in the sense favoured by the Congress and rejected by the minorities

"There can be no agreement on a Government responsible to the legislature until there is agreement upon the nature of the legislature and upon the whole structure of the constitution

"The Viceroy's offer, on the other hand, presents to the Indian leaders an opportunity of taking an effective and important part in the government of India and bringing their influence to bear on the conduct of the war without prejudice to their several positions. They will have committed themselves to nothing except working together in the present emergency for the safety and good of India and for the common cause in which they all believed

"In spite of the discouraging attitude shown in Congress quarters, I still hope that they will all be willing to take their part. If that should, unfortunately, not prove to be the case, Lord Linlithgow will, of course, still go ahead prepared to work with those who will work with him and with each other

No Inferior Position In Commonwealth

"The Viceroy's immediate offer does not, however, stand by itself. His initiative have been concerned as I said just now, not only with India's fuller participation in the actual present war effort, but also with paving the way towards a speedier attainment of the goal at which we are aiming

"May I say a word about that goal, Dominion Status, as it has commonly been described, or as I prefer to describe it, a free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth. It is not, as is so often implied when Dominion Status is contrasted with full independence, an inferior or dependent status. The status in the Commonwealth of the Dominions—or of this country for that matter, for our status is the same though not perhaps our stature—is indeed superior to that of nations that perforce stand alone

"How many so-called independent nations are really free to live their own lives as they will, even when they are not directly overrun or dismembered by more powerful neighbours? We of the British Com-

monwealth enjoy something more We enjoy the security, the prosperity, the friendship and, I would add, the enhanced dignity in the eyes of the world which come to each of us as a result of our free and equal association

"There is no higher status in the world than that, and that is the status which we have declared to be the goal of our policy in India

"Our declarations, however, have apparently still led in certain quarters doubt as to the sincerity of our purpose and have raised, not unnaturally, the question both of the time when and the methods by which we mean to fulfil them It is to that question that the Viceroy, with the full approval of His Majesty's Government, has now given an answer which marks I think a notable step forward on the path to the accepted goal

"May I quote here the most significant passage in the Viceroy's statement—'There has been very strong insistence that the framing of that scheme'—that is the new constitutional scheme for India—should be primarily' the responsibility of the Indians themselves and should originate from Indian conceptions of the social economic and political structure of Indian life His Majesty's Government are in sympathy with that desire and wish to see it given the fullest practical expression, subject to the due fulfilment of the obligations which Great Britain's long connection with India has imposed on her and for which His Majesty's Government cannot divest themselves of responsibility'

"The recognition of these obligations is not an impairment of status but only a recognition of facts historic or geographical which differentiate the present position of India from that of other Dominions As the late Lord Balfour pointed out in his remarkable exposition of the nature of British Commonwealth relations in the constitutional report of the Imperial Conference of 1926 'the principles of equality and similarity appropriate to status do not universally extend to function', and he instanced, in particular, the functions of defence and foreign policy

A Difference

'It is in respect of these, for example, that the position of India, both in virtue of her historic, military organisation and of her geographical position, differs from that of the Dominions But the difference that arises from these and similar obligations is one of degree and not of

kind For in the case of every Dominion, there has always been some measure of adjustment, formal or informal, to British obligations. Subject to these matters, the desire of His Majesty's Government is that the new Constitution of India should be devised by the Indians for themselves and should—may I quote the words again—'originate from Indian conceptions of the social, economic and political structure of Indian life'

"That task is to be undertaken with the least possible delay after the war by a body representative of the principal elements in India's national life That means a body constituted in agreement between the representatives of the elements It does not mean a body set up on lines which may commend themselves to one particular element, however influential, but may be regarded as wholly unacceptable to the minority elements

"His Majesty's Government have made it clear that they could not contemplate the transfer of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life In this matter, too there is no departure from the principles which have governed the coming into existence of every Dominion constitution In every case in the Dominions, there has been antecedent agreement, not only between the geographical units but also between the main racial elements—English and French in Canada, British and Boer in South Africa—both as to the method of framing the constitution and as to the constitution itself

"Agreement, consent, is indeed the foundation of all free government, of all true democracy Decision by majority is not so much of the essence of democracy as a practical convenience, which presupposes for its proper working an antecedent general consent to the constitution itself It has, indeed, in most federal constitutions been limited in various ways in order to safeguard the separate interests of the federating elements

"To describe the need for such agreement as a veto on constitutional progress is, I think, to do an injustice to the patriotism and sense of responsibility of those concerned Agreement means not veto by any elements but compromise, and willingness to compromise in India, as elsewhere, is an essential test of the sense of responsibility on which free government must be based

"On the other hand, within the limitations imposed by the necessity of securing agreement, the whole constitutional field is open to re-examination. It may, indeed, prove to be the case that it is by entirely novel departures from the existing scheme, whether in the relation of the Centre to the provinces or to the States or in the methods of election and representation, that an agreement can be reached which is unattainable within the framework of the existing Act, based as it is on the traditions of India's administrative past and on our customary British constitutional conceptions.

Date of Reforms

"So much for the question of method. There is the question no less insistently asked as to the date. Here the answer given by the statement is also clear. The decisive resolution of these great constitutional issues, the actual setting up of a new system of government, cannot come at a moment when we are all engaged in a desperate struggle for existence."

"How soon it can come after the war is essentially in India's own hands. The experience of every Dominion has shown that these fundamental issues are not lightly or speedily settled. What I have told the House of the complexity and difficulty of India's peculiar problems does not suggest that her experience in this respect will be essentially different from that of others.

"There is always an immense amount of preliminary discussion, inquiry and negotiation which has to be got through before the real decisive meetings take place. There is absolutely no reason why any of this indispensable preliminary work should wait for the end of the war. The more completely and thoroughly it is done now, the agreement reached now as to the form of the post-war representative body, as to the methods and procedure by which we should arrive at its conclusions and as to the principles and outlines of the constitution itself, the more speedily can everything be settled after the war is over.

"So far as His Majesty's Government are concerned, they have offered to welcome and promote in any way possible such preliminary friendly discussion and investigation and have equally promised to lend every aid in their power to hasten decisions on all relevant matters when it comes to the subsequent task of finally settling the constitution.

They can do no more The responsibility for securing a speedy as well as satisfactory result rests upon the Indians themselves

"I submit that the Viceroy's initiative represents a sincere effort on our part to make such contribution as we can towards the smooth and speedy attainment of the desired goal Others must also make their contribution No one element or party can hope to get all that it wants, or at least to get all at once If we agree upon the end, let us all work for it with sympathy, understanding, patience and goodwill towards each other That at any rate is the spirit in which His Majesty's Government are resolved to persevere in the carrying out of the policy which they have now defined So far, we in this country are concerned, we have every reason to be proud of what we have contributed in the past to the history and to the life of India

"But I at any rate, believe with Lord Macaulay that the proudest day of our history will be the day when we see India joining, a free and willing partner, in the brotherhood of the British peoples As for India she will give, I know, her effective answer to tyranny and aggression in the field of war But she can give an even more conclusive answer in the field of constructive statesmanship

"In a world threatened by all the evil forces of hatred and destruction, of partisan and racial intolerance there could be no more hopeful portent, no more assured omen of the ultimate victory of our cause, than that the leaders of India's millions should in peaceful agreement resolve not only their own perplexing discords but also afford yet one further example within our British Commonwealth of the power of goodwill to reconcile freedom and unity and through our Commonwealth to bridge the agelong gulf between Europe and Asia Then indeed could we say with justice that the dawn of a better day for the world was heralded in the East "